

<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 71-305		8716	1	4	16
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Environment</i> 625</li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2339- 2342</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1942</li> <li>• 1999- 2014</li> </ul>

**H-112**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

Monday, May 10, 1971 47

hospital services for his or her child. It would seem to me that there is some misunderstanding there and purely for the legislative history, may I ask the introducer of the legislation to indicate clearly that this would apply both to the father and to the mother of the child referred to in that paragraph.

djh

MRS. GRISWOLD (109th):

Mr. Speaker, this would apply, I believe both, I know both to the father and to the mother, through you to the questioner.

MR. FRATE:

Any further remarks? Question is on the bill as amended. All those in favor of the bill as amended, say aye. Opposed, no. The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Bottom of page 6, Calendar No. 687, Substitute for H.B. No. 8716, An Act Concerning Mandate for Construction of Sewer Project or Disposal Plant Project, File No. 635.

MR. MILLER (156th):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment. Will the Clerk please read the amendment? Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving time, could I move that we waive the reading of the amendment?

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mr. Stevens of the 122nd, the reading is waived.

MR. MILLER (156th):

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the amendment.

MR. FRATE:

Question is on the adoption of the amendment. Remarks?

Monday, May 10, 1971

48

djh

MR. MILLER (156th):

Mr. Speaker, this bill involves a mandate for construction of sewer project or disposal plant project and the amendment provides that if the municipalities do not cooperate, they will have to pay the cost to the state. I urge the passage of the amendment.

MR. FRATE:

Any further remarks on the amendment?

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, this amendment, I think, marks a significant direction that the General Assembly is taking in the area of sewage and water pollution consistent with many of the things we've already done this session. It does provide that in the event the municipality refuses to take any action, the Commissioner of Public Works may go in, do the work and then assess the municipality for the amount that the state has paid to correct these problems and it further provides that in the event the municipality fails to pay the installments back to the state, that their state aid may be withheld to the extent that any of their unpaid balance on these particular projects is done. It's a tough amendment, Mr. Speaker. It's a necessary one and I strongly support it's adoption.

MR. FRATE:

Are there further remarks on the amendment?

MR. PRETE (114th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the adoption of this amendment. There's no question that it is a tough amendment. It provides tough remedies for a very, very difficult problem. The rate at which our rivers and streams and lakes is being polluted is alarming. I think we need little documentation of that. This amendment is a tough one. It puts teeth in the bill. I concur

Monday, May 10, 1971

49

that we need teeth in our environmental legislation. I move the adoption of this amendment.

MR. FRATE:

Any further remarks?

MR. AVCOLLIE (94th):

Mr. Speaker, I'd only indicate that I support the amendment. I introduced this bill to provide for the municipalities completing their sewer projects when mandated without the necessity of referendum on the dollar amount needed to do the work. The other side of the aisle has offered what I consider a very valuable amendment, a tough one indeed, but one which really makes some sense out of our previous clean water legislation. I support it wholeheartedly.

MR. FRATE:

Any further remarks on the amendment? If not, all in favor of the amendment, say aye. Opposed, no. I will rule the amendment technical so we'll proceed with the bill as amended.

MR. MILLER (156th):

Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A".

MR. FRATE:

The gentleman from the 156th proceed.

MR. MILLER (156th):

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that the legislative body of any town or city which is ordered by the Water Resources Commission to construct sewers or a disposal plant to abate or control water pollution shall establish a sewer authority and authorize the necessary funds for the project. Mr. Speaker, this is a necessary bill and I urge it's passage.

Monday, May 10, 1971

50

MR. FRATE:

Are there further remarks on the bill?

MR. CLARK ( 14th):

Mr. Speaker, just one question. I'm not opposed to the bill or the amendment but would this bill give the town or community some limit or would the order of the commission establish a date for them to establish this Housing Authority, this Sewer Authority, pardon me.

MR. FRATE:

Does the gentleman from the 156th wish to answer?

MR. MILLER (156th):

Mr. Speaker, in order to try to answer Mr. Clark's question, I can only state that as provided in the bill, we're dealing here with Chapters 474 and 474a, I cannot specifically answer the question, I'm sorry sir.

MR. COLLINS (165th):

Mr. Speaker, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I can throw a little light on this. I think that all of the orders that have been issued under the prior legislation have contained compliance dates by which the municipality must take action. This is in the event that the municipality for one reason or another does not take action by that date, it allows the Commission to either go into court and institute an injunctive action requiring them to do it or in the alternative, under the amendment or the bill as amended, would allow the public utilities commission to go in and actually complete the work. The answer is yes, there is a cut-off.

MR. FRATE:

Any further remarks? If not, it has been moved, the passage of this bill as amended. All those in favor, please say yes. Favor, no? The bill is passed as amended.

djh

S-80  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1971

VOL.14  
PART 5  
1921-2435

May 14, 1971

22.

further? If 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. 680, File 667, Favorable report joint standing committee on the Environment on H.B. 8303 An Act Concerning the Faccination of Imported Cattle.

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 Amendment Sch. A.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR PAC:

All cattle that are imported into this state have to be vaccinated. However, the farmers are having a difficult time restocking their herds. Most of the states around us are actually in the country there are only two or three that require vaccination. So this bill would permit the import of any cows that are over six months of age. Or any bulls over seven months of age. Providing they have had a blood test within 30 days of the import. And it has a second section that permits the veterenarian that are employed by the Department of Agriculture, they are not accredited in the state, but they are certainly certified as far as their duties are concerned to conduct this test.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further? If not all those in favor signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 681, File 635. Favorable report joint standing committee on Environment Substitute H.B. 8716 An Act Concerning Mandate for Construction of Sewer Project or Disposal Plant Project.

May 17, 1971

Page 47

signify by saying "aye". Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Rule technical, you may proceed with the bill, as amended.

SENATOR DINIELLI:

I move for adoption of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule A and Senate Amendment Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR DINIELLI:

The same remarks apply.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

No further business on the clerk's desk.

THE CHAIR:

Recognitions. Senator Pac.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President. Being the prevailing vote, I would move to reconsider a bill that was passed Friday. It was listed as Calendar No. 681, File No. 635. An Act Concerning a Mandate <sup>8716</sup> for Construction of Sewer Projects and Disposal Plant.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark on your motion?

May 17, 1971

Page 48

SENATOR PAC:

There seems to be some question regarding the impact of this bill and I thought we should bring it back and make sure we don't pass any bad legislation.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on reconsideration.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose reconsideration. I believe that the bill was well prepared, I think it's long overdue. I can't conceive that there would be need for an amendment. In fact, one of the amendments that was placed on it by the House I think we considered in 1967 and again in 1969. I think it's a good bill as it stands; I think it's long overdue. It certainly has given to the people of Connecticut the followup of what we're saying when we go out and campaign throughout the State of Connecticut that we really mean that we're going to get down to the business of abating pollution in the State of Connecticut, so that I oppose the reconsideration of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Pac, did you give us the file number? It would help me if I could just look at the bill, understand the discussion.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, the File No. is 635, Calendar No. was 681.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on reconsideration. Will you remark further?

SENATOR HOULEY:

Yes, Mr. President. I requested Senator Pac, whose committee

May 17, 1971

Page 49

gave a favorable on acceptance of this bill, if he would not move to reconsider. There's one basic point that I wish to make for the Chamber. This is not, this is not a partisan request in any form, and I would hope that when the vote is taken which will not be a roll call or standing vote that it will not be along party lines. What I'm doing is asking this Chamber to simply review previous action in the event that some might have missed the impact that this might have, particularly on some of the smaller communities. This bill, in effect, Mr. President, destroys all form of home rule when it comes to the question of a sewer project. It says in effect that we really don't care what you folks in a given town or community have to say by way of a referendum. We really don't care what your feelings are or what your problems may be and we don't want you to discuss it or put it to any type of referendum because we, the water resources commission, are going to tell you in your community exactly what we want you to do, and you are going to do it. It says that a community's point of view, whatever it might be, does not matter. We don't really care what your economic problems are; we don't really care of what the considerations are that you might have with reference to your density in a given area, and that, in effect, water resources is going to play God in this instance and their ruling, if you will, will be upheld, and there is no appeal; and there is no appeal for any given community. Now, what I'm asking is a review. And I'll be very honest. I have mixed feelings about the bill because the previous speaker

May 17, 1971

Page 50

hit the nail on the head, and that's a very, very accurate and a very, very good reason why perhaps this bill should pass. But I wonder if perhaps we haven't moved a little hastily here and haven't debated this in our respective caucuses around the floor. Think, if you will, of a rural community with forty square miles that does have a problem that does not have any sewer project or treatment plant, and water resources comes and makes a finding that you will sewer the town of X, or Y or Z and this could be any one of our areas incidentally; or even within a metropolitan town. It might be not only terribly expensive but it might not even be feasible for water resources to give their verdict. So what I'm asking for really is a very simple overnight review. I ask you to consider for example Tolland County with its thirteen towns; I ask you to consider particularly Eastern Connecticut where we have many, many, many square miles of open space where we have a low density population, where we have been confronted in the past decade with phenomenal growth; growth that is twice the average of the state; where we have built schools, after schools, after schools; where our people really, like all people in the state of Connecticut, really are up against it when it comes to taxes and I think, in essence, what I'm saying is that let us, at least overnight, reevaluate. Then after a complete reevaluation, if the consensus of this Chamber is the same, then fine. So be it. And I want to reiterate my last point which was also my first, that Mr. President, this in no way is a partisan situation or a partisan matter at all, and I would hope that

May 17, 1971

Page 51

when we vote on this that if there have been some legitimate points of view that we might ought to consider or we should consider, then they'll be considered on the basis of reevaluation only and not certainly along political lines, and I'm sure that won't be the case.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on reconsideration. Senator Eddy.

SENATOR EDDY:

I agree with many of the things that Senator Houley has said. I think it's a chance to reevaluate it right here. I think our vote to reconsider or not to reconsider will be a reevaluation of this idea behind the bill. I favor the bill. I'm going to vote against reconsideration. I think that what we're doing here is upgrading pollution as something that is too large a subject to be left to communities, particularly those who presently will suffer more than anybody else because of lack of sewer facilities. I totally can sympathize with what Senator Houley has said. Many of his points are accurate. I think the problem is what we're deciding here is do we believe in this, or don't we. Do we believe in sewage disposal plants or don't we. If we believe in them for Hartford, or New Haven or Bridgeport, we should believe in them for the whole state. And that's what this pollution movement is all about. Now the assumption that is being made here that the water resources commission is automatically going to go into every small town right away and order every one of them to put in expensive sewage facilities. I don't think this is

May 17, 1971

Page 52

necessarily true, but I think that if they do go in and say yes, you do need these, you're polluting your lakes. We have bills in here now which are to prevent algae from forming in lakes. All this is because many rural communities are in worse shape and potentially and vastly in worse shape than the heavily, densely settled areas such as the cities and suburban areas. So we are really reevaluating the importance of this bill in this discussion and I think that the bill should pass for the simple reason it's going to test whether we mean this or don't mean it. And that's really all I have to say. I oppose, maybe I should stop right now since the mike is off, but I oppose reconsideration because I think we have considered this. I think most of us decided the matter of pollution was too important a matter to be left to the whims or the local political sentiment; despite all the very good reasons that my friend, Senator Houley, has brought out, I think we should vote against reconsideration.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President, I too rise to oppose the reconsideration. I oppose reconsidering because I'm afraid this bill will be killed and I like this bill and I think it's a very important bill to put on in our statutes. In general, I approve of the concept. Specifically, I would like to tell you what a very bad situation we have had in my own town which is why I feel strongly about it. Senator Houley says we shouldn't let the water resources commission play God. But the truth of it is that in some communities, and particularly in mine, that I know, there

May 17, 1971

Page 53

may be others just as bad, someone else plays God, and that's the chairman of the sewer authority. The sewer authority is given tremendous powers under the law, and in my town we have been trying for twenty years to get sewers in one of our very old, closely built up shore areas. It's a disgrace. The situation is a real disgrace and we finally, after about fifteen years, have gotten the water resources commission and the department of health to order sewers. But it's not moving, even now. This very powerful chairman of our sewer authority can find ways to stall off, and stall off and we're not getting it. I believe in home rule but there comes a time when I'm willing to give in on that, and I don't think anyone need worry about the water resources commission rushing around giving orders and playing God. It's almost impossible to get them to move and I don't think we need fear an on-rush from them.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Mr. President, I don't feel that this has the great home rule impact that has been put before us by the Senator from the thirty-fifth. I think when you stop and realize that we're talking about water pollution that comes down on the neighbor downstream from you, and all you have to do is look at the Housatonic River where the people in the upper part of the river are facing up to it and the people in the lower part of the river have faced up to it for many years, this is what we're talking about now because we're talking about towns who absolutely have not faced up to a moral obligation of cleaning up their mess.

May 17, 1971

Page 54

I'll agree with Senator Hammer on this business of our godly type water resources commission. They certainly haven't been aggressive. Right now, almost all the orders on municipalities are at least two years behind the orders that they were given back in 1967. Another point that I might bring up at this time, this talk of the cost of the communities and that type of thing, I might point out to you that there is no request this year for the water resources to have any further funding in the bonding for the clean water program. The reason for that is, there's \$83,000,000 laying over there that hasn't been encumbered by municipalities to build their treatment plants so that we're talking about 80% prefinancing by the State of Connecticut, so that we're talking about a 20% obligation on a town that they'd have to go into to build a sewers treatment plant. Mr. President, I say that it's a good bill, it's a long overdue bill. I think it's been properly prepared and I don't think we have any, well there's no qualm in my mind as this being a fine bill and another tool in the arsenal to abate pollution.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President, just one more thing on this bill. I can't remember what it was. Sorry.

THE CHAIR:

We'll stand at ease a moment while you explore your mind. I have the same problem Senator.

SENATOR HAMMER:

Mr. President, what I wanted to say, if I may finally pull myself together, is that I wonder if we shouldn't take a look

May 17, 1971

Page 55

at the statutes which have set up the sewer authorities. The power there is terrific and I just wonder if maybe it's out of balance, and too much power is put there and not enough power or defense with the people. Whatever committee is involved, I would be so happy to have them take a look at it.

THE CHAIR:

I will call on Senators Pac, Murphy and Houley in that order. Senator Pac.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I made some bad choice of words in my initial move to reconsider, and the words I used was that perhaps we might be passing some bad legislation. This does not mean that I thought it was bad legislation, not at all. But I thought out of courtesy to fellow senator I owed it to move this and perhaps explore some of the questions on his mind. However, let me say this that the municipalities have no home rule insofar as sanitary conditions are concerned. I don't think home rule was meant to include this area. It doesn't include solid waste disposal, air pollution nor any of the other areas. They do have some prerogative of passing laws but they don't have the final say in any of these areas. And a point has been made previously that the water resources commission is not just going to run around and mandate that they all put in sewers. In areas where they have these forty square miles or some odd land, I don't think they're quite ready to mandate that sewers be put in. Obviously, the ability of the soil to absorb this kind of, any type of

May 17, 1971

Page 56

cess pools there would be, wouldn't be taxed very much. What we are talking about is in areas where it is a detriment to health. So in these areas, of course, they would mandate it. At that point, what is the sense of having a referendum on the books. The town goes through this process of a referendum, they may turn it down, and at that point the town fathers have no say in it, they're automatically in a day or two, they start facing \$1,000. fines. I think it's an inconsistency in our statutes and should be remedied.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Murphy yields to Senator Houley.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, for the second and last time, I think Senator Hammer touched on a very interesting point. If I can paraphrase it that maybe we ought to look at local sewer authorities. This is precisely one of the reasons why I think we ought to reconsider this bill, which we're doing. What comes next? Do we then in Hartford say to the 169 communities, we don't care what your thinking is in Town A, or B or C. We're now going to pass a piece of legislation in Hartford which is going to tell you exactly how you shall set up a local sewer authority, who shall be on it, and what the jurisdiction and responsibilities would be. I think we're establishing a precedent here that we ought to think about. If we pass, well we have passed this measure, if we do not reconsider, and if it is signed into law, are we not really establishing a precedent where at some future date, where

May 17, 1971

Page 57

a local community did not assume its responsibility, where we in Hartford and the General Assembly will say now we are going to legislate for each and every one of the towns. I hear all the time that perhaps we do too much of this. Now, on the water resources commission specifically, I defy anyone in this Chamber to go to them at this point and ask them to define what, in their opinion, is a pure return to a stream after treatment. And I cite you case in point of the Rockville, Connecticut sewer treatment plant, where some seven years ago, this particular community, then a city within the town of Vernon, decided that they certainly should face up to their problem and they did, in fact, get up \$3,000,000 to build a sewer treatment plant. Two years ago, the water resources commission came and said it is not performing up to its capacity; to which our local government said fine, what capacity do you wish us to perform to. And they said we're not sure, but whatever you're doing is wrong; build yourself a whole new plant. At the present time, the town of Vernon, for example, is involved with a \$3.8 million dollar project. Now this is happening throughout the state, so that the point, I think, is that maybe we ought to get some definitions as to what is a pollutant and what is not a pollutant from water resources. Ten years ago, for example, a satisfactory treatment was 70%. Today, they won't accept anything less than 95%. Now if you build it today at 95%, according to the water resources edict, who is to say that 4 years or 5 years hence that that won't be satisfactory and a municipality that has gone to this expense, will be asked

May 17, 1971

Page 58

again to build a tersory plant at two and three million dollars. Let's go on to another point that I think is important. We talk in terms that this really isn't going to cost that municipality an awful lot of money because 85% of it is reimbursable by the federal and by the state. Well, try to get it and try to get a commitment, and try to get a check as work is being completed and each and every one of you here has, I think, experienced that factor so that I don't want on the one hand sound that I'm for pollution because obviously no one here is for pollution. We share a common interest in our concern for it. But all I am suggesting here is that maybe, just maybe, we're moving a little bit too quickly. We're not allowing local communities to have any option. Senator Pac earlier stated that at the present time a referendum does not make any difference anyway because water resources has the authority to come in and say you will, in fact, comply. Now, if that is the case, are we being redundant in this measure. If the authority is already there now as the previous speaker has indicated, do we need to again pass this bill and say it again. So I'll conclude; I suspect I know how the votes going to go and I appreciate everyone's interest in this. I merely wanted to point out that there might be a precedent here that would bode ill to home rule in the future, and leave it at that and see where we are. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on reconsideration. Will you remark further?

SENATOR PETRONI:

Mr. President and Members of the Circle. I would like to

May 17, 1971

Page 59

agree, or I do agree with the remarks of Senator Pac as far as the question of pollution being beyond the jurisdiction of certain home rule principles. The question I have in my mind now, there are two questions in my mind now; one I would like to know if it's in order what the amendment would be that Senator Houley has in mind, and secondly, when I read the language here that requires that a town who has been ordered by the water resources commission to abate pollution, the language that the town shall establish a sewer authority, leaves some question in my mind. From the experience of my own town of Ridgefield, we have been ordered by the water resources commission to replace a certain plant that is obsolete, and we are doing that, but we did not appoint a sewer authority. We are doing it through our Board of Selectmen and I wonder if this kind of legislation, or these words are necessary in this bill. If you deleted the words "shall establish a sewer authority", I think it would be a better bill in my own mind. That is, once you are ordered to abate or control water pollution, and you authorize the necessary funds to undertake the completion of the project, I think that would be sufficient. I don't think it's necessary for this Circle and this Assembly to order the method by which a town or city should have to do it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator, in reply to your first question, it is in order to request of Senator Houley if he so desires to state the nature of any proposed amendment because that would have a bearing

May 17, 1971

Page 60

on your vote on reconsideration.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I do not propose any amendment. Motion was to reconsider the bill and we're doing so. With reference to his second question, I'll take the liberty of answering. One need not establish a separate sewer authority. The Board of Selectmen can be the sewer authority or any local government can be both at the same time.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on reconsideration. Will you remark further?

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Just very briefly to say, Mr. President, that I fear I might find myself in the same position as Senator Houley one day and this by no means indicates that I would change my vote from the other day, but I do feel that he has asked for reconsideration and if that's what he'd like and had it on the Calendar another day, I'd certainly be willing to vote and support his motion.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, thank you very much Mr. Majority Leader. I'm perfectly willing to accept that Senator Eddy pointed out - we are in the process of reconsideration. We have busy schedules ahead. I think we're very attentive for which we thank you all and I think a very simple vote at this time will resolve the question.

May 17, 1971

Page 61

THE CHAIR:

I understand you entirely. The question is on reconsideration. If you vote yes to reconsider, the bill will be brought back, may be defeated; it will be brand new on the floor again; it may be amended; may be debated, etc. If you vote no on reconsideration, the bill will stand. Was it a House bill originally? Alright, will stand ready for the Governor's signature as it now stands. All those in favor of reconsideration signify by saying "aye". Opposed, nay. The chair is seriously in doubt and does not wish to take the responsibility of deciding this, other than by a standing vote.

SENATOR PAC:

I move that when the vote be taken, it be taken by roll call.

THE CHAIR:

Roll call?

SENATOR PAC:

Either a (interruption)

THE CHAIR:

I think Senator Houley would be satisfied with a standing roll call.

SENATOR HOULEY:

If the good Senator Pac would withdraw the roll call motion, I'll be very content with a standing (interruption)

THE CHAIR:

The chair is able to perceive certain things from this

May 17, 1971

Page 62

eminence up here that I think Senator Houley would feel that a standing vote would be very fair and very fair. Senator Pac.

SENATOR PAC:

I withdraw my motion for a roll call.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Pac. Will all senators in the hall or the caucus rooms or let's get out in the Chamber outside, Mr. Clerk. Will all senators who wish to vote on a standing vote on a motion to reconsider, please start towards the Chamber. That's good enough. If there's no objection. All those in favor of the motion to reconsider, please rise. All those opposed to the motion to reconsider, please rise. No one rise twice. Fourteen in favor of reconsideration. Fifteen opposed. The motion of reconsider is defeated.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, thank you very much. Thank the members of the Circle and apparently, I just can't get through to any Republicans.

THE CHAIR:

Well you moved me to the heart, Senator, but I didn't have a vote this time. Any further business on the Calendar?

SENATOR CALDWELL:

There's no further business, I move that we stand adjourned until tomorrow at 1 o'clock. I would like to point out that tomorrow will be a non-controversial day.

THE CHAIR:

Will we start relatively soon at 1 o'clock?

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**ENVIRONMENT**

**PART 2  
339-691**

**1971**

WEDNESDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 31, 1971

escaping therefrom, in such manner or quantity as to constitute a hazard or nuisance to other users of the highway." Now this is the general statute which is involved. The Clean Air Commission has written to the State Police Department about this particular statute, because it has not been enforced to any considerable degree, and I'm going to give to your committee...

Rep Ciampi: Excuse me one minute, please. We're going to have a few more representatives speak in front of this committee, but seeing as there's such a crowd, we're going to adjourn after the representatives, and we're going to have this meeting in the Hall of the House. But before you rush out, let me say this. It's only going to be till 1:30, so from now on, any speaker, we'll give five minute time limits. Now, it's going to be at the Hall of the House; if you want to leave now and get your places ... but remember, please, 1:30 it's going to be all over, so any speakers, just hold your speeches to five minutes. Thank you very much.

Rep. Beck: All right, again I apologize to the audience. On the 14-271, this has not been enforced by the State Police to any meaningful degree, and in their correspondence, I would like to point out that one section contests the actual role of the statute, and says that the statute does not say that loads must be covered; the statute is too broad and too vague in nature; only that if there is a covering, then it must be securely fastened. And they state here that they have issued 235 summonses 1970 under this, and then say "In conclusion, we do not have any new or innovative suggestions relative to the enforcement of motor vehicle violations you mentioned." And specifically, this is the Commissioner of Health. "As previously stated, any priorities are channeled to more serious violations; however, if sufficient manpower were available to us, we would enforce these sections."

Now, what I'm here to ask the committee to consider is whether you would tighten up that section, 14-271 - and I have asked the legislative commissioners to draft a section which would do this, which would provide that there would be penalties in law; right now there are regulations, and these are not being enforced, there's correspondence going back and forth, and meanwhile, the homeowners near this area are not being adequately protected, and frankly, as one legislator, I've been called countless times on this. I don't have the time, really, to take care of this kind of problem; with the best of intentions, I'd like to relieve other legislators of this kind of problem, because it's come up in a number of other areas. And I think if your committee would be willing to go over that section, I would certainly be most happy to give you this material and follow up anything you want me to do, to tighten it up and do a proper job on it. I appreciate your time, and I'm sorry.

Rep. Avcollie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to speak briefly to two bills, before the committee, H.B. 8715. AN ACT CONCERNING PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE NECESSITY FOR SEWER INSTALLATIONS, and H.B. 8716. AN ACT CONCERNING MANDATE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SEWER PROJECT OR DISPOSAL PLANT PROJECT. H.B. 8715 is a rather simple bill, which gets serious or can be serious to those people that may have sewer projects going past their property. Presently, there's no requirement that a property owner have any hearing in advance of the installation of a sewer project, and in my own town, I've had a number of constituents who have already been damaged to a