

<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 71-99		7629	3	1	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Environment</i> 520</li> <li>• <i>Environment</i> 521</li> <li>• <i>Environment</i> 526</li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1303(<i>consent</i>)</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1124- 1125</li> </ul>

**H-110**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

Thursday, April 8, 1971

5.

favorable reports I move the passage of the following bills on the Consent Calendar:

MBS

Calendar No. 252, File No. 198 <sup>HB 6478</sup> An Act Concerning Water Resources Commission Powers Over Radioactive and Thermal Discharges.

Calendar No. 253, File No. 199 <sup>HB 7629</sup> An Act Concerning Cruelty to Animals.

Calendar No. 254, File No. 200 <sup>HB 7645</sup> An Act Validating the Notice of Ruel S. Smith to the Town of Stonington.

Page 2, Calendar No. 261, File No. 144 <sup>SB 344</sup> An Act Concerning the Licensing of Pet Shops.

Calendar No. 267, File No. 146 <sup>SB 435</sup> An Act Concerning Retirement of State's Attorneys.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection to any of these matters being taken up under the Consent Calendar? If not, all those in favor of the motion indicate by saying aye, all those opposed? The bills enumerated are passed.

WILLIAM A. O'NEILL, 52nd District:

Mr. Speaker, bottom of page 1, Calendar No. 258, File No. 202, Act Concerning the Compensation of Legislative Employees. Be removed from Consent Calendar and passed retaining its place on the regular calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Calendar No. 258 is removed from the Consent Calendar, is theevery...is there objection to the matter being retained?

**S-78  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

April 20, 1971

Page 20

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 244. File No. 180. Favorable report of the joint committee on Public Health and Safety, Bill No. 244, Concerning Jurisdiction of Charges Against Practitioners of Podiatry.

SENATOR PAC:

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

This bill in effect, would permit the Board of Examiners for Podiatry currently, these examiners act or hearing, they can take disciplinary action only by a unanimous vote of the committee. This would permit them to take action by a majority vote. This is the case in most of our boards for the healing guards. Indeed, I think, this is the case of most of our State Boards, I think the present situation is really impracticable.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 245. File No. 199. Favorable report of the joint committee on the Environment. House Bill No. 7629. An Act Concerning Cruelty to Animals.

SENATOR PAC:

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

This bill would delete some of the legal and symantic loopholes that people who commit cruelty to animals hide behind. I'm talking of course, if you look at your file, the use of words like, unlawful cruelty that

April 20, 1971

Page 21

constitutes unnecessary cruelty? It seems to imply that some amount of cruelty is permissible. Cruelty abandoned. Isn't the abandonment itself an act of cruelty? It gets rid of archaic language that was written into this law many, many years ago. I think this is a good bill for all of our animals and dog lovers etc.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you for that poetic explanation. Question is on passage. 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. 247. File No. 175. Favorable report of the joint committee on Public Personnel and Military Affairs. Substitute for House Bill No. 7817. An Act Concerning Transcripts of Proceedings Before the Personnel Appeal Board.

SENATOR BURKE:

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

This bill allows the State Employees to get a transcript at a reasonable fee not to exceed fee paid by the Hartford City Courts and the Court reporters. I move passage.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, question is on passage. All those in favor signify by saying, "aye"/ Opposed, "nay". The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 248. File No. 187. Favorable report of the joint committee's on Public Health and Safety. House Bill No. 3075.

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**ENVIRONMENT**

**PART 2  
339-691**

**1971**

FRIDAY  
10:00 A.M.

THE ENVIRONMENT

MARCH 19, 1971

Rep. Matthews, 161st District: I know this is possibly an expensive question to ask, but you could in your water protection factor put a large fence all the way around the water and still have the lands open for people to use for hunting and fishing, so for the most part I would think you could protect your water; that's the major problem you have.

W. Glynn: No; it's the water-shed too. It's the place from which the water comes. As I mentioned in this particular article that I handed in this was a situation where there was no direct contact between the human and the water.

Rep. Matthews: That was one specific incident, I'm sure there were thousands of animals all around the water-shed as they would naturally go to that area.

Rep. Puggleise: Just one further on the same subject. Mr. Glynn, suppose legislation were passed that said the Water Company must open up these properties to limited recreational uses, and let the Water Companies with the Health Department as consultants establish the conditions under which they would be open. Could you live with legislation of that nature?

W. Glynn: Well, we'd have to obviously; but it would be the one thing that's a little difficult in a hearing for public utilities is that in the mind's of many people including some legislators there seems to be a feeling, and I'm not referring to your viewpoint Rep. Puggleise, that somehow this utility has suffered in a part. On it I would say as far as the Water Works Association is concerned, we represent many municipals, and the private companies the stock is publicly held, their rates are as you know governed by what the cost are, and their allowed a certain rate of return, that we're only talking about the people that are served by the Water Company. But I would say this, that if this type of legislation were to pass, the cost of water would certainly go up because it would mean that there would have to be more controls exercised, more security people hired in order to make sure the regulations imposed by the Health Department or other agencies were adequately enforced, and again it would be necessary to treat this water much more than is now the case. I don't know; I suppose you've all had the experience of going to other parts of the country, and you go to a hotel and you get a glass of water, and it doesn't taste as good as the water back home. Well of course part of this is what your used to, but also part of it in many cases is that the water has to be treated much more than the water in Connecticut has to be treated. Therefore, it doesn't have that quality of taste that we enjoy in this state. I've tried to answer your question Rep. Puggleise.

Rep. Puggleise: We like to put you on the spot.

James Shaw, East Haddam: I'm representative of the Humane Society of the U.S. I wish to speak to two bills of the U.S. I wish to present the first one which is H.B.7629, endangered animals. I have a short state-

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

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 contrib-