

<b>Act Number</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Bill Number</b>	<b>Total Number of Committee Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of House Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of Senate Pages</b>
PA 71-248		6699	0	8	3
<u>Committee Pages:</u>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2148-2155</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1715-1717</li> </ul>

**H-112**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 5  
1968-2502**

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

29

report and passage of the bill. Will you remark.

REPRESENTATIVE YACAVONE:

This bill will place the (inaudible), the Greater Bridgeport Mental Health Center, the Greater Hartford Mental Health Center and the Albany Avenue Child Guidance Center under the Department of Mental Health included with all the other facilities of the department as one agency under the Commissioner of Mental Health. I urge passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. If not, the question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. All those in favor will indicate by saying "Aye". Opposed. The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Calendar 638, Substitute for House Bill 6699 - An Act to Ban High Phosphate Detergents.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 89th.

REPRESENTATIVE CIAMPI:

The Clerk has an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage, the Clerk has an amendment. Will the Clerk read the amendment.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, offered by Mr. Ciampi of the 89th.

ad

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

30

ad

In line 60, delete "five and one-tenth" and insert "eight and seven tenths".

In line 68, delete "four and one-tenth" and insert "seven".  
MR.SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 89th.

REPRESENTATIVE CIAMPI:

The reason for this amendment, as I find the detergent industry is responsible, and I do not make this charge lightly. Let me give you a reason for my statement and then draw your own conclusion. First they mark a detergent which contain enzymes which cause skin rash, serious allegeric responses to many people and to print any warning in their advertising or on their boxes. Secondly, they place any on the market with sufficient testing or to discover with it a tragic effect of the substance on the environment. Third, (inaudible) detergents which turn life supporting lakes into dead seas. The reason for this, we do not want to panic the manufactures into flooding the market with phosphate substitutes which may, in the long run, turn out to be just as harmful as the phosphates. That is principally the reasoning for the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule A. Will you remark further. If not, the Chair will try your minds on the amendment. All those in favor will indicate by saying "Aye". All those opposed. The Amendment is adopted. The question now before us is on acceptance and passage as amended. Will you

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

31

ad

remark. Gnetleman from the 89th.

REPRESENTATIVE CIAMPI:

The bill which you have before you at this time, in my opinion and the opinion of many throughout our state, one of the most significant and constructive pieces of legislation we will see this session.

The legal effect of this bill, as amended, is quite simple. First, as of February 1, 1972, it will forbid the sale and distribution of any detergents within the State of Connecticut which are not labeled as to their phosphoric content or which contains more than a specified maximum concentration of phosphorus. Secondly, it will forbid the sale and distribution within the State of Connecticut of all detergents which contain any phosphorus as of June 30, 1973.

While the legal effect is thus quite simple, the rationale behind the bill and the ecological effects of the bill are somewhat more complex. Without going into a lot of the technical jargon and chemical processes, let me simply explain it this way: An excess of the chemical phosphorus causes a condition known as eutrophication, which results in an excess growth of Algae, a depletion of dissolved oxygen (and therefore the death of fish and other aquatic life), foul odors, and a general lowering of aesthetic and recreational values of our bodies of water. The phosphorus can enter a body of water from many sources, but a primary source is the household detergents which are regularly dumped into our waters. It has become a

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

32

ad

widely recognized and accepted responsibility of government to put a halt to the dumping of dangerously large quantities of phosphorus in our water. For example, a clean up plan for Lake Michigan calls for a ban of all phosphate detergents by 1972 as its first step.

This bill does not go that far. As I said before, we do not want to panic the detergent manufacturers into flooding the market with phosphate substitutes which may, in the long run, turn out to be just as harmful as the phosphates. I think this bill takes a reasonable approach to the problem. By imposing a ceiling on the concentration of phosphorus for next year and by forbidding phosphate detergents the following year, we are able to quickly diminish the quantity of phosphates being dumped in our waters while at the same time giving the manufacturers a reasonable amount of time to develop an adequate alternative.

The abolition of phosphate detergents is not going to result in an automatic revitalization of our polluted waters nor even result in a complete halt to eutrophication. But it is an essential step in that direction, and as such it demands the full support of this Assembly.

I feel I speak for the people of Connecticut when I say the detergent industry has worked at a slow speed long enough. It is time that they conform to our timetable and develop a safe product now. I urge adoption of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair notes House Amendment A is technical, will you

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

33

remark further on the bill as amended. Gentleman from the 165th.  
REPRESENTATIVE COLLINS:

This bill represents a recommendation basically a recommendation of the environmental task force which has had the support of both the former Governor Dempsey and Governor Meskill. The task force did recommend a ban on all detergents with unreasonable phosphate content and I think the Chairman of the Environment Committee has spelled out many of the problems that these phosphates pose. I think that this bill is a step towards our continuing commitment to make the water in the State of Connecticut as clean as possible and demonstrates the obvious concern of the General Assembly this session for attempting to solve our environmental problems.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended. Gentleman from the 118th.

REPRESENTATIVE AJELLO:

I would like to join with the gentleman's remarks in that as he indicated yesterday, we all here are concerned with the environmental problems and to again point out in passing that while many of these bills are coming out as individual and single bills and might not seem at any one point to be more significant than a single bill. They are building a mountain, if you will, of definite acts which are bringing us closer to the kind of environmental policies that we want to see in the State of Connecticut. I would point out that the Democratic party in its

ad

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

34

platform is strongly committed to this kind of a course and as the gentleman has pointed out and as I reiterate, we all here are, so that the significance of these bills cannot be underestimated as they come one at a time and the committee should be congratulated, being a new committee, for its excellent progress particularly in this most aggravating field. I think we are taking definite action.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. Gentleman from the 73rd.

REPRESENTATIVE LAVINE:

I would also like to rise in support of the passage of this bill. I believe that the detergent industry has been irresponsible. What we need to look at basically is the amount of phosphorus or phosphates in detergents. We find that some of the household names such as Biz contain 73 per cent of phosphates, Tide has as much as 49. It is things like this which really disturb the members of the Environment Committee, we heard this testimony, we had housewives come before us and say that they thought we should ban phosphates completely. There is one other point which should be made and that is that Connecticut is a basically a soft water state and a little bit of cleaning powder goes a much longer way. One final note which the Chairman of the Environmental Committee has sounded, and I think we should all be alert to, and that is, it is very possible for the detergent companies to come back with nitrates or some other chemical which in fact will do even more damage than the phosphates

ad

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

35

that they had in their detergents right now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. Lady from the 128th.

REPRESENTATIVE PEARSON:

I think we must congratulate the Chairman of the Environment Committee for reporting out this bill. The laundry detergent industry has had plenty of time to correct this situation. The detergent industry must provide us with products that are not only effective but safe for the environment. We all know that the effective modern sewage treatment is really the answer. But many of the areas in Connecticut cannot physically install them and so they are actually non-existent because of the high cost of construction and for the cost and maintenance. A great deal of pollution comes from the phosphates and these detergents that are being used. It is an unsightly problem and I think we are paying for all of these added so called zip that the industry has been putting in our detergents for our washing machines and has been causing this ugly dead water that we have. The pollution prevention program that we are now setting up for the state of Connecticut with this bill, I think will really help solve the problem right in the home where I call, which is the beginning of this problem is where it is really at. I think it is an excellent bill and I hope that the House will support it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. If not, the question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and

ad

Wednesday, May 5, 1971

36

passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule A.

All those in favor will indicate by saying "Aye". Opposed. The bill is passed.

CLERK:

Page 8 of the Calendar. Calendar 642, House Bill 8683 - An Act Providing an Annual Appropriation for Loyalty Day Parades, File 591.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 118th.

REPRESENTATIVE AJELLO:

May this item be passed temporarily.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection. Hearing none, the matter is passed temporarily.

CLERK:

Calendar 644, Substitute for House Bill 6834 - An Act Concerning Prompt and Full Payment by Dealers in Milk and Milk Products.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 79th.

REPRESENTATIVE IWANICKI:

I move the acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and the passage of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you

ad

**S-79**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 4  
1457-1920**

May 11, 1971

29.

not all those in favor of passage signify by saying aye. AYE.  
Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 600, File 869 Favorable report of the joint  
standing committee on Environment on Substitute H.B. 6699 An Act  
to Ban High Phosphate Detergents.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Pac.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's  
favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by House  
Amend. Sch. A.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR PAC:

One of the great problems of our day is the premature  
aging of our still water. This is a condition that's known as  
putrefication. And it takes place when nutrients in the form of  
detergents, fertilizers, human waste discharge into our lakes.  
All through our streams via the sewage route into our lakes.  
This causes an excessive growth of plant life in these lakes.  
They in turn wither away and die, decay causing, using up and  
consuming all the oxygen. At this point the lake becomes un-  
inhabitable insofar as aquatic life is concerned. And unfit for  
human use as far as recreation purposes. This bill would restrict

May 11, 1971

30

the amount of elemental phosphate that could be contained in any detergent at 5.1% by weight. This restriction would apply or begin with Feb. 1 of 1972. A total ban would be called for by Feb. 1, of 1973. Excluded from this ban would be any dishwashers. Any detergents produced for the purpose of use in dairying or restaurant purposes or industrial purposes. I think this is a good bill. It provides for penalties from \$100 to \$300 for the first violation of up to \$300 to \$500 for subsequent violations. I don't think this is the final step or the step. And inasmuch as there are other areas that cause this pollution, but I think its a good step forward.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? Senator Ives.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I rise to support this bill. But I am disappointed in the percentage levels that were established. I think under the present situation the, we are delaying too long in cutting down on the phosphates. Several of our states and namely Florida have set up a total ban as of Jan. 1, 1972. And I am a little bit disturbed in allowing the commercial users to have an extra year and three months which this bill does. But it is a step in the right direction. And for this reason I will support it.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not all those in favor of

May 11, 1971

31.

passage of the bill signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 9, top of the page, first item. Cal. 602, File 587 Favorable report joint standing committee on Committee on the Environment on Substitute H.B. 6834 An Act Concerning Prompt and Full Payment By Dealers in Milk and Milk Products.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Pac.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR PAC.

Currently any milk dealer when he buys his milk from the milk producers or the Association of Milk Producers must pay for that milk by the 21st day of the following month after which he bought this milk. This bill would require that the resale outlets that handle the dealers milk. Or whatever marketing agency does handle it from them would have to pay the bill to him. Ten days prior to the date that he has to pay this bill. I think this is an excellent bill. Too often the retail outfits have taken advantage of the poor dealer. And have in a sense after they have worked up a good bill gone to other dealers and