

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-7		5808	8	4	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Environment</i> 23 • <i>Environment</i> 36-38 • <i>Environment</i> 55-56 • <i>Environment</i> 303 • <i>Environment</i> 309 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 502-506 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 482-483

H-109

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 2
449-973**

claims lies there waiting to be instructive. We have in our coastal area numerous industrial plants, businesses which would very soon adopt itself to any development or commercializing of these resources. We are fortunate in having at Noank, under the University of Connecticut, a marine laboratory for research. We have at the University of Connecticut branch at Avery Point in Groton a very remarkable geographic location and courses in the study of marine resources. I believe this resolution will encourage activity which they now hesitate to go into in our University Branch at Noank Laboratory because of some concern that we might be involving ourselves in the private industrial area. I think that by the passing of this resolution we would remove any such question in the minds of the university policy-making to develop courses and laboratory research in this area. I strongly recommend the passage of this resolution. Thank you.

MBS

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there further remarks on the resolution? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, those opposed. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 15. H. B. No. 5808. An Act Concerning Bounties. In your file number 8.

DAVID LAVINE, 73rd District:

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

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

7.

MR. SPEAKER:

MBS

Question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

DAVID LAVINE, 73rd District:

Mr. Speaker, historically we are here considering the repeal of two bounty bills. Bounty bill, which is Sec. 7-132, mandates that each town shall pay a bounty of \$5.00 for the killing of any bobcat or lynx. Under Sec. 7-133 the bounty on snakes and wild animals any town may, by vote of its legislative body, call for a bounty on fox, rattlesnake, copperhead snake, Belgian hare, porcupine, woodchuck. Historically, Mr. Speaker, the bounty laws were passed to protect human life, property and livestock. Today the bounty system is considered by public and private conservation groups to be biologically unsound in the light of modern knowledge. Predators are no longer considered to be the villains that they once were and many are known to be highly beneficial to the interests of man. At one time the key to successful game management was thought to be the elimination of a species which preyed upon game. Numerous studies have shown that the elimination of a particular predator did not change the highs and lows in the population level of the prey. There is another argument equally as cogent for the elimination of bounties. They simply do not work. Indeed, the bounty system in Connecticut has practically vanished as a practical matter. In 1969 bounty was paid on four bobcat, actually lynx are extirpated in the state of Connecticut, also

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

8.

one copperhead was taken, no rattlesnakes, one Belgian hare, I don't know where they found him, but they got one Belgian hare and 12 woodchucks. And it was a big season on woodchucks because in the years from 1960 to 1969 no bounty had been paid on woodchuck. One-hundred eighty fox were presented for bounty and these were at 24 town halls. Now, there are two special areas which might be of consideration. One is snakes which often have people puzzled, excited and perplexed. In fact, the poison information center in this state reports no fatalities from snake bites in the last 13 years. Secondly, there is the area of rabies from fox and it has been suggested that the bounties were an effective control for rabies. However, the Public Health Service in our own Fish and Game Department says there are ample controls within the state commission for health for this particular problem should it arise. To sum up, the bounty system is biologically unsound, it is unworkable as a practical matter and it is unused at this time. The elimination of bounties in no way stops the camper from protecting himself or limits the farmer from protecting his crops, livestock or equipment. We simply do not encourage any longer the elimination of a species by reimbursing individuals for killing them. Thank you.

FRANCIS J. COLLINS, 165th District:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us and I want to take the opportunity to compliment Rep. Lavine on a rather thorough and I think informative statement on bringing

MBS

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

9.

this bill out. I would hope that many of the bills that we are to see in the next three months would have equally as good a detailed background for the reason for the elimination of the two statutes to which he referred. There is one matter that he did omit that I think we ought to take cognizance of because I've had town treasurers tell me that they think that at least one of these bills should be repealed because it requires the town treasurer when the person comes in for the bounty to split the ear of the fox in order to make sure that only one bounty will be paid and that should be reason enough for its repeal.

MR. SPEAKER:

I understand a further inquiry comes from the members of the press wondering whether or not they will be able to have Ground Hog day in the future if this passes.

THOMAS J. DONNELLY, 46th District:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to second the remarks of Rep. Lavine and Rep. Collins and I think we should take this moment to take public note of the fact that this bill has grown out of the concern of some of the youngsters in our state, most particularly the fifth grade at Eli Terry School in the town of South Windsor but this is an example of the concern and active concern of some of our young people, a great deal more of it is evident but this perhaps is the first piece of legislation to result from the direct active interest of our young people, particularly with the matter of ecology and our environment and I think it deserves special note on that account along. I do

MBS

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

10.

urge adoption of the bill.

MBS

MORRIS HOGAN, 177th District:

Mr. Speaker, I dont' rise for mutiny on the bounty but we do have a nice young town clerk in our town and I'd hate like the devil to see her cuttin' the ear off a rattlesnake.

JOSEPH S. COATSWORTH, 76th District:

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of any of my constituents who might happen to be bobcat, woodchucks or Belgian hare, I would like to associate myself with this bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Anyone here from the Humane Society? Further remarks? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, those opposed. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 22. Substitute for House Bill No. 5764. An Act Concerning Dogs Roaming at Large. File No. 14.

CARL R. AJELLO, 118th District:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Calendar 22, Substitute for H. B. No. 5764, file number 14, be recommitted to the Committee on Environment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Hearing none the bill is recommitted.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 24. H. B. No. 5842. An Act Validating Notice of Michael Devanno to the City of Norwich. File No. 15.

WILLIAM C. LEARY, 43rd District:

S-77

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1971

VOL. 14

PART 2

474-956

March 11, 1971

Page 9

Page 2, bottom of the page:

CAL. NO. 43. File No. 34. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations. Substitute House Bill No. 8068. An Act Concerning State Grants for School Building Projects.

SENATOR HOULEY:

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

THE CHAIR:

Any remarks?

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, this bill represents the estimated balance due to Towns for school building grants pursuant to Section 1 of Public Act 751, enacted by the '69 Session of the General Assembly. The amount of 9.8 million dollars to a period ending June 30, 1971. Payments will be due April 1 of this Calendar year and there are in fact several towns and municipalities anxious to have this commitment.

I urge the passage of this measure.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? Question is on the acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. All those in favor indicate by saying, "aye". Opposed? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 44. File No. 8. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on The Environment. House Bill No. 5808. An Act Concerning Bounties.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable

March 11, 1971

Page 10

report and passage of the bill, IN CONCURRENCE with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR PAC:

Yes, Mr. President, this bill will do away with the practice of paying five dollar bounties for Bobcat and Lynx. And it also does away with bounties on snakes and other animals. I think at this point, in trying to use an worked phrase, we need to protect them rather than exterminate them. It is a good bill.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? If not, question is on the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Those in favor indicate by saying, "aye". Opposed? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 46. FILE NO. 12. Favorable report of the Committee on General Law. House Bill No. 5845. An Act Authorizing An Action by Fred Gereroso Against the City of West Haven.

SENATOR STRADA:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR STRADA:

Mr. President, this bill will validate a defective notice given to the City of West Haven on July 20, 1970, respect to injuries received on January 27 as a result of a fall on allegedly a defective sidewalk. There was no

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

ENVIRONMENT

**PART 1
1-338**

**1971
Index**

THURSDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 11, 1971

Chairman Ciampi presiding;
Sens: Pac, Gunther, Cashman, Eddy
Reps: Ryan, Miller, Matthews, Locke, Clark,
Stroffolino, Iwanicki, Ciampi, Pugliese, Hogan,
Platt, Yacavone, Cohen, Fox, Tiffany

Rep. Iwanicki: Ladies and Gentlemen, the Environment Committee is now in public session. We're going to start off with the legislators first. I wish when the public comes up, you would announce your name and who you are representing, and then continue on with your speech. Where is Rep. Donnelly who will be the first speaker today?

Rep. Donnelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am T. J. Donnelly, 46th Assembly District, here to offer to you some very brief remarks concerning H.B. 5808, AN ACT CONCERNING BOUNTIES, before you this morning. This bill concerns itself with two sections of the General Statutes, 7-132 and 133 which concern bounties now presently offered for the killing of various forms of wildlife. 7-132 offers a mandatory bounty, that is, the State is required to pay a bounty of \$5.00 for each bobcat or lynx killed; and 133 is an optional form of bounty permitting towns to pay various sums for various other species of wildlife, including Belgian hares, rattlesnakes, copperheads, and so forth. There is another bill that I've heard about in the press, introduced by Rep. Cohen from the 177th - I think to the same effect, but I have not yet seen the bill. Briefly stated, the purpose here is to repeal what seems no longer an appropriate public policy of encouraging by money payments the killing of wildlife, disturbing thereby the balance of nature. There are some young people here in the room this morning who will speak in the public portion, students at the Eli Terry school in South Windsor, who brought this matter to my attention. I urge you to give this matter your careful consideration. Thank you.

Rep. Iwanicki: Any questions on the Committee? Thank you.

Rep. Truex: Mr. Chairman, I am Rep. Ruth Truex from the 23rd District, and I am here in support of H.B. 5453, AN ACT CONCERNING HUNTING, TRAPPING AND FISHING LICENSES FOR ELDERLY PERSONS, submitted by Rep. Kablik and myself, concerning hunting, trapping and fishing licenses for elderly persons. It's a very simple bill, it simply would repeal Sec. 2632 to provide for free hunting, trapping and fishing licenses for persons 65 years of age and over. I have checked with the proper authorities at the Tax Department and have found that this would not be a serious problem financially to the State of Connecticut, because there are not that many licenses issued to those over 65 years of age. I also talked with our Town Clerk to check on the numbers in Wethersfield, and he held up his two hands, and said not more than that many. So I don't think it's financially a great loss to the State of Connecticut if we provide these persons 65 years of age and over with a free complimentary fishing and hunting

bit on this. Connecticut does have a mandatory hunters' safety program, and has had such a program since 1956. It's difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs, but I think in the ten years following 1966 as compared to the ten years which preceded it, there was a decrease of approximately 21% in hunting accidents in this state, and this was the time that there was a significant increase in license sales. Now, the information which the committee was handed earlier is a national compilation of hunter safety statistics, hunting accidents, and statistics say an awful lot unless you examine them closely. Connecticut contributes to these statistics, so a part of their statistics are ours. But I'd like to point out to you what happens. In 1966, we had a single fatal hunting accident in this state. In 1967 we had none. In 1968 we had a single fatal hunting accident. However, this man fell out of his boat and drowned. But it's classed as a hunting accident. In 1969 there were five classed 'fatal' hunting accidents; three of these were drownings. In 1970 there was one, which gives us a total of eight during the entire period, four of which were drownings. Now, if you look at the same period of time you come up with 32 fatal fishing accidents where people have drowned, and I'm sure if you looked at the boating collision incidents, boating fatalities, you'd find that many, many, if not most or all forms of outdoor recreation exceed hunting when it comes to fatal accidents. If my memory is correct, and I can believe what the press writes, and usually they're pretty good, I think there were more fatalities as a result of snowmobile operations during 1970 than there were as a result of hunting accidents. If you gentlemen would like this documented, I have it and would be glad to provide it for you. Aside from that, I will remain in the audience for a short period of time and be available for any questions or clarifications on any of the bills which we have an interest in this morning.

Rep. Ciampi: Thank you. Louise Evans.

Miss Evans: I'd like to speak of H.B. 5808. I am a teacher at Eli Terry school in South Windsor. We got interested in the fourth grade class last year as we were studying the development of animals on earth, we got interested in the role of the predator and this is the result. This is a bill which we, as a class, wrote last year. I have with me today five members of last year's class, presently fifth graders, each of whom would like to speak for a short while on this bill.

Andy Glassman: My name is Andy Glassman, and I'd like to speak about the chain reaction of when you put a bounty on one animal, it's just like putting a bounty on many other animals, because when you kill off one kind of animal, it acts as though you're killing off other kinds. Because, like, for instance, the bobcat, it helps keep the environment level, and it doesn't make it bad when it eats off other animals, because it levels it off. When you kill off

THURSDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 11, 1971

more than one or many, it doesn't help the environment. Thank you.

Rep. Ciampi: One of the representatives wants to ask Mr. Bampton a question.
Ruby Cohen. Rep. Cohen?

Rep. Cohen: Mr. Bampton, I'd like to ask a question on this bill of mine that I've introduced, H.B. 5604, AN ACT CONCERNING THE PURCHASE OF PHEASANTS BY THE STATE BOARD OF FISHERIES AND GAME. The way the bill is written, it wasn't intended that way to stifle the buying of pheasants from out of state. It merely - what we are after is that you people should buy your pheasants from local breeders if you can buy them for the same price that you can from out of state breeders.

Mr. Bampton: I would agree to this condition, without question. Some of the breeders have informed me this morning that apparently this was not done. I told them that it should have been done; if it hadn't been done, it would be done next year.

Rep. Cohen: Another question. Is it true that you people bought 1,000 pheasants from the state of Pennsylvania and sent four game-wardens to pick them up? And when they arrived in Connecticut, 50 of them were dead?

Mr. Bampton: No, it is not. These birds were shipped into Connecticut into a central distribution point. We have the right to reject these birds as we pick them up in Connecticut. Obviously they don't get any credit for birds which die during transit or for birds which might be physically weak. We simply reject them.

Rep. Cohen: The out-of-state breeders do deliver to you people in the state?

Mr. Bampton: Yes, they do, you see, it's our option.

Rep. Ciampi: Thank you. Diane Demero?

Miss Demers: Last year we studied about predators and how they keep the balance of nature. We found out that predators are necessary in keeping this balance. We have found that there were some bounties on some of these predators, Section 7-132 was bounties on bobcats and lynx. 7-133 was on hawks, and owls and other wild animals such as rats. And we have here a list of names of people who are against this, for Bill 5808. In order to keep this balance, we would like the bounties removed off of these animals. Thank you.

Rep. Ciampi: Thank you. Shelia Maguire?

Miss Maguire: My name is Shelia Maguire, and I'm here to talk about predators. And the bobcats are predators, and if we kill off all the bobcats, the animals that they eat will be more and more of them, because not all the animals

THURSDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 11, 1971

that eat them will be eating them. So, we should try and save the bobcat.

Rep. Ciampi: Thank you, Shelia. Jim? Jimmy, get up here.

Jim Thibodeau: My name is Jim Thibodeau. I'm here to talk about the balance of nature and why animals are important, such as the owl and the bobcat. The owl and bobcat are important because some people kill them because they receive money for them, and they are important because they kill off mice and things that eat corn and things on the farm. And maybe we never see these bobcats or owls, but we like to know that they're still there, and that they eat mice and bobcats, I mean, mice and rats and rodents. Thank you.

Rep. Ciampi: Thank you. Joan Jensen. Joan, excuse me for a moment. I know both the Senator and I came in late to the meeting. I want to introduce myself, I'm Rep. Frank Ciampi, Chairman of the House, and Senator Stanley Pac, our Senate Chairman of The Environment Committee.

Miss Jensen: My name is Joan Jensen, I'm from Elmwood. I am here in regards to the euthanasia bill. People are working on this animal euthanasia bill across the state of Connecticut. They are doing so voluntarily because of the great need to prevent the pain and horror that some facilities are inflicting on animals while killing them. It does not make sense to rescue and then inflict a painful death. We are doing our best and will step up the program of educating people -that unless they are breeding animals, the animals should be castrated or spayed to prevent an overpopulation of 10,000 per hour being born every day. This would, of course, preclude, all the euthanasians being done. In the interim, we must kill without pain and stress. Thank you.

Rep. Ciampi: Thank you. Bobby Cummings.

Bobby Cummings: My name is Bobby Cummings. Last year in fourth grade in Miss Carolin's and Mrs. Evans' class, a lady came to talk to us on skulls and bounties. So she brought in several skulls of the rabbit, the owl, and the lynx. She talked to us of how important the balance of nature is on the bobcat. She told us that if we turn off the bobcats, the animals that they eat will start getting more and more. There'll start being more of them. She talked to us on that, we saw several movies on it. So we studied about that, so now Mrs. Evans and Miss Carolin got us together, and got us to come here today. So here we are. Thank you.

Rep. Ciampi: Louis Marietta. Mr. Marietta, we're going to change our format. You can talk on any bills you want to speak on.

Mr. Marietta. Well, I would like to begin by saying I really feel sorry for these young kids here because ...

THURSDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 11, 1971

Rep. Ciampi: No, Senator, I'm not cutting you off. Do you have many more questions? If you have - we could bring Mr. Nelson back to us in Executive session, if you have many. If you have just -

Sen. Gunther: Last one. You don't know, or probably you do know, how much of a cultching program was conducted by the commercial oyster growers in the state of Connecticut last year? Was it 50,000 bushels, 100,000 bushels?

Mr. Nelson: Approximately a quarter of a million bushels.

Sen. Gunther: 250,000 bushels. Of course I quoted the figure in 1889, 8,000,000 - almost 9,000,000 bushels - so that we didn't have the growing area, the farmer wasn't out there to catch the set even if we had it. And the only area it has to go, really, right now, is primarily to the commercial beds and to some choice natural beds. Isn't this true?

Mr. Nelson: We are making an effort to do what we can, and I think I know that you were instrumental in an effort on the Bridgeport beds, which was unfortunately not great, because of limitations, but most mindful of that, and also let me say, Senator, that we thank you for the cooperation you have given us, we know that you are in favor of bringing back this resource, and we just, however, have to take issue with you out of these bills.

Rep. Ciampi: Thank you very much, Mr. Nelson. We'll move on to the next speaker. Mrs. Bertrand Brown, Glastonbury.

Mrs. Brown: Mrs. Bertrand Brown, Chairman of the Glastonbury Conservation Commission, speaking for the Commission for H.B. 5036 regarding soils mapping. The town of Glastonbury is very fortunate; we have a complete set of soil maps. We find them indispensable for all kinds of land use planning. This is the kind of information a town has to have, you have to know where the wet spots are, where the ledges are, in order to make any kind of intelligent decision about what to put where, and what not to put where. We feel this information should be made available as soon as possible to all Connecticut communities, and for this reason, endorse and increase the appropriation for this purpose. Thank you.

Rep. Ciampi: Thank you, Mrs. Brown. Mrs. Tanya Metaksa.

Mrs. Metaksa: Chairman, members of the committee, I am Tanya Metaksa, representing the Connecticut Sportsmen's Alliance. The Connecticut Sportsmen's Alliance is the political action organization for all the sportsmen of Connecticut. I am here to endorse two of the bills that you are considering. The first is H.B. 5808 introduced by Rep. Thomas J. Donnelly. This bill would repeal the bounty laws now in existence. The bounty system is not needed in the

THURSDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 11, 1971

state of Connecticut as long as we have a wildlife management program to control any overpopulation that may result. The second bill we endorse is S.B. 13 sponsored by Sen. George Gunther. This bill would allow hunting and fishing in reservoirs. Ladies and Gentlemen, land for outdoor recreation in the state of Connecticut is at a premium. We must provide for the multiple use of our natural resources. The purpose of this bill is to open the watershed areas to the hunter and fisherman on a controlled basis. The State Board of Fisheries and Game would regulate the use of these areas in conjunction with the State Health Department. Connecticut is one of the two remaining states in this country that prohibits multiple use of its reservoirs and surrounding areas. I think the over 100,000 fishermen would like to know that there is more trout in these reservoirs than in all the other fishing areas of the state combined. Both H.B. 5808 and S.B. 13 would benefit the sportsman, whether he be a hunter or a fisherman, and are supported by the Connecticut Sportsmen's Alliance. However, Mr. Chairman, S.B. 244 sponsored by Sen. Wilber G. Smith, to prohibit all hunting in Connecticut is unequivocally opposed by the Connecticut Sportsmen's Alliance. We oppose this bill both in theory and in practice. The Sportsman who has led the conservation movement in this state and in this country would be outlawed under this bill. It is the sportsmen who support the State Board of Fisheries and Game that returns wildlife to the environment to be enjoyed and utilized by all the people of this state. It is the sportsmen who, since 1937, pay a self-imposed 11% Federal Excise Tax on sporting arms and ammunition. This revenue, under the Pitnam Robertson act, is returned to the state for scientific research, game management, land acquisition and sportsmen's programs. It is an interesting fact that more non-hunting species of wildlife are supported by these programs than are game species. It is the sportsman who established, long before ecology was a popular slogan, such organizations as Ducks Unlimited, the National Wildlife Federation, and the Isaac Walton League in order to save our wilderness and our wildlife. Must the hunter who has been in the vanguard of the conservation movement become the scapegoat for an environmental crisis? The sportsmen of this state say no. The Connecticut Sportsmen's Alliance cannot and will not support S.B. 244. Thank you, gentlemen.

Rep. Ciampi: Thank you, Mrs. Metaksa. Mr. Arthur Reckert.

Mr. Reckert: My name is Arthur Reckert, I'm the vice president of the Bristol Fish and Game Association, I'm also on the Board of Directors of the Connecticut Wildlife Federation, which is the Connecticut affiliate of the National Wildlife Federation. We'd like to go on record of opposing S.B. 244 which is the no hunting bill, presently before the legislators. Also we would oppose H.B. 5604 unless it is amended to include competitive bidding. Thank you.

Rep. Ciampi: Mr. Daniel Juliani.

Mr. Juliani: I don't have an in-built stepladder, and I hope you'll forgive me. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am S. Daniel Juliani of West Hartford, President of the Northeastern States Council of Sportsmen, legislative director

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 26, 1971

Our forests have not been killed off. Never more than 5% of the oak forests die when defoliated more than twice. This insect is not destructive, but only an annoying nuisance. We don't need to spend taxpayers money for such an unscientific project. All the major scientists and all the major conservation organizations in Connecticut have opposed this bill during the last four bienniums. It is not needed. As for research, the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station should, by now, have studied this insect to death. They should have set in their budget (several million dollars) to include research money on gypsy moth, not expect the legislature each year to increase and hand over this political plum. The Governor cut the Connecticut Research Commission Budget as being a low priority. We feel he could also do the same at our 2½ Agricultural Experiment Stations, which have a total 1969-1971 budget of over 3½ million dollars in a state that only has 4000 farms and a diminishing agriculture. We know the farms should be protected with other kinds of legislation, but we don't feel that the gypsy moth money is worth it. The U.S. Forest Laboratories of the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Hamden, Connecticut, has the world's expert on gypsy moth, Dr. Campbell. He has done gypsy moth research of all kinds for years. The Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station does not need to duplicate this research. Next week the National Audubon Society will send each and every legislator a sheet position on gypsy moth written by a biologist who knows the insect. Let's once and for all kill this issue. You may be interested in knowing that over \$100,000,000 spent on gypsy moths so-called eradication; \$100,000,000 since 1900 I hope you will consider not passing this legislation. I have another statement here. I'll just read in brief, on behalf of the Connecticut Audubon Council which has over 10,000 members in this state. They are against Sunday Hunting with bow and arrow or with anything. They are not against hunting however. On bills H.B.6627 & H.B.6728 that are concerned with bounties, I would ask that these bills be withdrawn because of your Committee passing H.B.5808 last week which is practically identical. I would'nt need to consider these even though they are practically the same. The two separate laws that authorize bounties over a hundred years ago and Mr. Bampton etc. have been against these bills. I have a personal statement here concerned with the Soil and Water Conservation Department of the Federal Government. This is personally on behalf of Stan Quickmire. I am personally against having Connecticut taxpayers picking up the tab of \$80,000 to help finance the 8 Federal Soil Conservation Service Districts when the government has cut their budgets because they found there was a low priority. Now we have always supported the Soil Conservation Service, but recently they have been involved in hundreds of stream canalization projects in the U.S. There's an excellent article in the December Readers Digest written by an expert on this, and I refer it all to you to read because it does summarize the stream canalization problems in this country. This money is going into their general kitty, it's not going for the worth-while things of soil-mapping and building wildlife ponds, and all the other excellent things they do. It's going to just help keep their department up so they can work on some of the projects of stream canalization also. I'd like to submit all these

FRIDAY
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 26, 1971

Sen. Pac: Any Questions? Thank you sir. Anyone else wishing to speak on any subject, except trapping, please come forward.

Ralph Engels: Representing the Connecticut State Grange. We wish to go in favor of H.B.7090 on the gypsy moths. In our organization, one of our members from our town took these pictures and I'd like to leave them with the Committee. It shows the destructive damage of the gypsy moth. And I also belong to the Connecticut Christmass Tree Growers Association. I come up to a notice saying that one acre of Christmas Trees produce enough oxygen to feed eight persons. In the State of Connecticut last year through the figures on the State Park and Forest Commission, over a quarter of a million acres of trees defoliated by the gypsy moths. And at 8 persons per acre that amounts to 2,000,000 people of oxygen. We believe that if the gypsy moths, when the gypsy moth just developed out of its age is the logical time to kill it pesticide, because it easily killed with it. I think there's a great deal of research is done on this that we can decimate the rates. And as you also know, I remember when I was a boy there used to be gypsy moths crews. They used to go through the woods all the time destroying the egg masses. I know the Grange feels that a volunteer program of people going out and killing these egg masses would do wonders; lets put it that way. Thank you.

Sen. Pac: Any questions? Anyone else? Thank you.

George Vesper: I'd like to speak in reference to H.B.6703. I appreciate this opportunity to speak before the legislative environmental committee. As Executive Director of the Roaring Brook Nature Center, and on behalf of our Board of Directors, I wish to express our opposition to the passage of this bill. The Roaring Brook Nature Center is entirely supported by its members. Our growth and success in recent years is indicative of a growing public awareness and appreciation of our natural environment. These people have a right to enjoy Connecticut's many miles of woodland trails on at least one day a week, Sunday, during the hunting season. To legalize hunting with a bow and arrows on Sunday, the one remaining day, would encroach unduly on the freedom of enjoyment of our natural areas during the hunting season. And if I may mention two of the arguments that I've heard in favor of this bill. 1. That November and December are two of the coldest months, this is not true. The records will show January and February the two winter months are the coldest ones. During November and December in the woods are open and somewhat warm and make available sights for observation. The other argument was the increase of time for those who could'nt hunt during the week. I would term this argument against them as saying this is the one day of the week when we don't want more hunters in the woods. This is the one day of the week when the rest of the population has to enjoy the wonders of our forests. I'd also just like to mention that as President of the Connecticut Herpetological Society we concurr with Mr. Stanly Quickmire, that H.B.6627 and H.B.6628 be withdrawn. And offer our support for H.B.5808 ~~to remove the bounties on all of our animals that such bounties exist~~ on. Thank you very much.