



Legislative History for Connecticut Act

---

SB 277	PA 348	1974
Senate - 1756, 2651-2653		(4)
House - 5736-5744		(9)
Environment - 181-182, 455-457, 459-460		(7)

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE  
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

20p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate  
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2014

S-102

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1974

VOL. 17  
PART 4  
1360-1817

Monday, April 29, 1974

232.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any further remarks? There being none, the question is on transfer to the Consent Calendar. Are there any objections? There being one, it is so ordered.

THE CLERK:

SB-277  
Page 6, Cal. 465. The Clerk has an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Costello.

SENATOR COSTELLO: (33rd)

I'll waive the reading of the amendment. It's merely to postpone the effective date because of the problems in licenses already having been issued for the current fishing season. The Department requested that the effective date not be upon passage but I believe it calls for October one, effective date. I would move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Let's take the adoption of the amendment at this time. The reading has been waived. The question is on passage of Senate Amendment Schedule A. All those in favor will signify by saying Aye. All those opposed will say Nay. THE AMENDMENT IS ACCEPTED and ruled technical. Senator Costello.

SENATOR COSTELLO:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is an act concerning commercial fishing in inland and marine waters. Basically it is a restructuring of the licensing and registration provisions for boats and those who take the marine life from the waters of

roc

S-104

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1974  
SPEC. SESS.  
JUNE

VOL. 17  
PART 6  
2162-2845

Tuesday, May 7, 1974

163.

Those Voting Yea . . . . .	29
Those Voting Nay . . . . .	7
Those Absent and Not Voting . . . . .	0

roc

THE BILL IS RECOMMITTED.

THE CLERK:

Mr. President, the Clerk has a Disagreeing Action on a favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Finance, Substitute Senate Bill 277, AN ACT CONCERNING COMMERCIAL FISHING INLAND AND MARINE WATERS, as amended by House A and Senate A.

THE CHAIR:

We have these disagreeing actions. Senator Rome, I would guess technically we need committees on conference on all of them. It would be a great assist to me if various committee chairmen or those involved in these disagreeing actions could come with me or come to me with appropriate names for the conference committee.

SENATOR TOME:

I believe they will, sir, but I think what's happened is that they have read the actions of the House and in most cases are not in disagreement with the House. Senator Lenge will be coming to you on two matters that will be read in for names of committee on conference but others I think we can accept or do it in concurrence with the House and dispense with the committee.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, of course, we can always do that provided the Senate is in full agreement. Senator Costello.

Tuesday, May 7, 1974

164.

roc

SENATOR COSTELLO: (33rd)

Thank you, Mr. President. I move acceptance and passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR COSTELLO:

Yes, the legal counsel in the House detected

THE CHAIR:

Excuse me, senator, again I am sorry. Just procedurally sure, would you please move suspension of the rules for immediate consideration.

SENATOR COSTELLO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would so move.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection? Hearing none, so ordered. Will you remark?

SENATOR COSTELLO:

This is the commercial fishing bill, Mr. President, which we passed a short while back in the Senate. The attorney's staff in the House detected some technical errors in the bill which they have corrected by House Amendment A. Basically the amendment clarifies sections 2e and 2f of the bill to insure that boaters who purchase live lobsters out-of-state or from licensed oobstermen do not inadvertently violate the commercial fishing laws by possessing these lobsters on state waters or by bringing them ashore. The amendment changes section 2(f) which prohibits

Tuesday, May 7, 1974

165.

the possession or landing of mutilated lobsters to provide that boaters do not violate the law by cooking and consuming lobsters on board. The other portions of the amendment are very technical in nature. I would move transfer to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

SENATOR ROME:

Mr. President, I move adoption of all of the matters earlier transferred to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

SENATOR ROME:

To simplify the procedures, I move suspension of the rules for immediate transmittal of all those bills that have been earlier adopted with the exception of Senate Bill 25. I'll make a separate motion on that.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is for immediate transmittal of all items previously passed on the Consent Calendar under suspension of the rules except for Senate Bill 25. Is there any objection? Hearing none, the rules are suspended.

SENATOR ROME:

Mr. President, I move suspension of the rules for immediate transmittal of Substitute Senate Bill 25, An Act Providing for Improved Rail and Other Mass Transportation Services.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on suspension of the rules for Senate Bill 25.

H-157

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1974  
SPEC. SESS.  
JUNE

VOL. 17  
PART 12  
5688-6143

Tuesday, May 7, 1974 49.

MR. SPEAKER:

efr

Referred to the Committee on Appropriations...Government Administration and Policy. The Chair stands corrected.

THE CLERK:

Page 2 of your Calendar, Calendar No. 745, S.B. 262, File 471, an Act concerning State grants for solid waste volume reduction and disposal operations. Favorable report of the Committee on Finance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 119th...finally cut the cord. The gentleman has cut the cord after all this time.

GERALD F. STEVENS:

Mr. Speaker, I move that matter be recommitted to the Joint Committee on The Environment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on the motion of reference on Calendar 745 to the Committee on Environment.

CARL R. AJELLO:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't have any objection to it.....if the Majority Leader feels so strongly about it.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favor of the motion of reference indicate by saying "aye". Those opposed. The bill is recommitted to the Committee on Environment.

THE CLERK:

Page 2 of your Calendar, Calendar 744, File 413, Substitute S.B. 277, an Act concerning commercial fishing in inland

Tuesday, May 7, 1974 50.

and marine waters. Amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A". efr

Favorable report of the Committee on Finance.

HAROLD G. HARLOW:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill, in concurrence with the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

HAROLD G. HARLOW:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think we want to move Senate "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk call Senate "A".

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A". L.C.O. 3045. In lines 335 to 336, strike out the words "from its passage" and insert in lieu thereof "January 1, 1975".

HAROLD G. HARLOW:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment deals with the effective date of this bill, which deals with the commercial fishing industry in Connecticut. It simply moves the effective date from passage to January 1, 1975, to give the Department of Environmental Protection and the fishing industry adequate time to be aware of enactment of this legislation. I would move its adoption.

MR. SPEAKER:

Tuesday, May 7, 1974 51.

Will you remark further on adoption of Senate "A"? efr

RICHARD H. WAGNER:

Mr. Speaker, may the Journal reflect that I've absented myself due to a possible conflict of interest.

MR. SPEAKER:

The appropriate notation will be made in the Journal. Will you remark further on adoption of Senate "A"? If not, all those in favor of adoption indicate by saying "aye". Those opposed. Senate "A" is adopted. The Chair will rule it technical. The Clerk is in possession of an additional amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", offered by Representative Harlow, of the 66th. L.C.O. 3090. Would you like the amendment read, sir?

HAROLD G. HARLOW:

No. I will attempt to summarize it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection to the gentleman summarizing House "A"? Without objection, please proceed with the summary.

HAROLD G. HARLOW:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before getting into the explanation of the amendment, I'd just briefly like to describe the bill, because a brief explanation of the bill is necessary to understand the amendment. In general terms, this bill reorganizes and clarifies and standardizes our existing commercial fishing laws. It also updates license and registration

Tuesday, May 7, 1974 52.

fees, and it provides for the licensing of all our lobster fishermen, including our skin-divers, and provides for licensing of primary purchases of lobsters for resale. The bill, itself, restricts the uses of certain means of taking fish, and it, also, bans the use of sea sturgeon. That's sort of a capsule summary, and this amendment, in essence, clarifies Sections 2e and 2f of the bill. In Section 2e, it insures that boaters who purchase live lobsters out-of-state, or from other licensed lobstermen, do not inadvertently violate the commercial fishing laws by possessing such lobsters on State waters, or by bringing them ashore. The amendment also changes Section 2f, which prohibits the possession, or landing, of mutilated lobsters, so as to provide that boaters do not violate the law by either cooking or consuming lobsters for immediate consumption on board. The last part of the amendment corrects a couple of drafting errors. The change in line 11 conforms the phrase describing the personal use of lobster license to the same phrases and language used elsewhere in the bill, and then the change in line 58 shifts a misplaced comma, and the change in line 292 to 294 eliminates a redundant section of the bill concerning the use of pound nets for taking of shad. I think that the amendment, which has the support of both sides of leadership, creates a couple of problems that we had with the bill, and also corrects a couple of drafting errors. I would move its adoption.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on adoption of House "A"?

RUTH H. CLARK:

Tuesday, May 7, 1974 53.

Mr. Speaker, that's really quite a long and complicated amendment, and I really would like very much to have a copy that I could look at before I have to vote on this bill. I would like to ask a question. Does it change anything in line 55, where it talks about lobsters being taken by skin-divers, or scuba-diving?

HAROLD G. HARLOW:

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no. This particular amendment doesn't.

RUTH H. CLARK:

I know that there are some states that prohibit the taking of lobsters by skin-divers and scuba-divers, and I would hope that if this bill doesn't provide for prohibiting this, that in the next session somebody will present a bill to do so, because the waters of Long Island Sound are so murky that it's practically impossible to find lobsters when scuba or skin-diving, and, consequently, what happens is these scuba-divers look for the lobster buoys, and they just go down the lines and raid the pots, and nobody can see them doing it under water, so I'm not sure that this answers the problem that some of my people have. I guess that's all. Thank you.

HAROLD G. HARLOW:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can help clarify it for the gracious lady. This particular amendment doesn't specifically deal with the taking of lobster as far as skin-divers goes. That...I'll get into that in a later presentation of the bill. The skin-divers are required to obtain a license in terms of

Tuesday, May 7, 1974 54.

fishing of lobster. We made changes in the bill, which I think efr  
will solve her problem. But I would urge adoption of the amend-  
ment as presented, unless there are other questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on adoption of House Amendment  
Schedule "A"? If not, all those in favor of adoption indicate  
by saying "aye". Those opposed. The amendment is adopted. The  
Chair will rule the amendment technical. The question is now on  
acceptance and passage of the bill as amended.

HAROLD G. HARLOW:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned  
previously, this bill deals with the commercial fishing indus-  
try in Connecticut and, primarily, with our State's dwindling  
lobster supply, which is in dire straits. I think most of us  
here know that the price of lobster on a commercial basis has  
approximately quadrupled in price and on the retail basis has  
more than doubled. It's the feeling of our Committee, and also  
the feeling of the Department, that if we don't move promptly  
to prevent the illegal and improper taking of our lobster sup-  
ply, the entire fishing industry in Connecticut, as well as  
some of our neighboring states, will be forced out of business.  
I might mention that this bill was submitted by the Department  
of Environmental Protection to assure that proper licensing and  
management of Connecticut's rapidly declining lobster popula-  
tion be taken in hand and worked out, so that we can save this  
industry. We drafted the bill in conjunction with the Depart-  
ment's recommendations, after having a considerable number of

Tuesday, May 7, 1974 55.

hearings along the coastline and also some personal interviews efr  
with the fishing interests, both commercial and recreational,  
in terms of our shoreline industry, and this bill represents  
a composite, or consensus, opinion between the professional and  
commercial people...the recreational people...the Committee...  
and the Department. It is an important bill, and I will try to  
just highlight some of the significant changes and then perhaps  
ask some questions. In essence, what the bill does is update  
our commercial fishing laws in the moves in force what we hope  
will be uniform regulations in terms of our neighboring states  
and also in terms of the State of New York. It does prevent  
the landing of mutilated lobsters, or undersize lobsters, which  
is one of the problems with our lobstering industry, and it also  
requires that commercial lobstermen must report their catches.  
It sets up, further, a licensing fee schedule with separate fees  
for commercial and recreational fishermen. The fee schedule is  
available to any Member of the Assembly. I have copies on my  
desk, and I also have submitted copies to the Minority Leadership  
and the Majority Leadership. I would like to point out that this  
bill does not propose a threat in terms of the licensing struc-  
ture, or in terms of retaliatory action by other states. Rhode  
Island, currently, does not license non-residents for lobster  
fishing, and the State of New York has a proposed license fee,  
which will be similar to the fee proposed under our license. In  
essence...

MR. SPEAKER:

All Members would take their seats...non-Members come

Tuesday, May 7, 1974 56.

to the well. The Clerk announce an immediate roll call. All efr  
non-Members please come to the well.

HAROLD G. HARLOW:

Wait a minute, sir. Mr. Speaker, I realize there's a  
message involved here, Mr. Speaker, and I'll try to summarize  
this very quickly, then...

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair had brought the gentleman ahead.

HAROLD G. HARLOW:

Okay. I move acceptance and passage, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

All Members would take their seats. Question is on  
acceptance and passage of Substitute for S.B. 277, as amended  
by Senate Amendment Schedule "A", and House Amendment Schedule  
"A". The machine will be opened. Has everyone voted? The  
machine will be closed, and the Clerk please take a tally.  
Gentleman from the 30th in the affirmative. Gentleman from the  
147th...affirmative?

JAMES F. BINGHAM:

Affirmative.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman from the 114th in the affirmative.

The following is the result of the vote:

Total number voting . . . . .	135
Necessary for passage . . . . .	69
Those voting Yea . . . . .	136

Tuesday, May 7, 1974 57.

Those voting Nay . . . . . 0 efr  
 Those absent and not voting . . . . . 15

MR. SPEAKER:

The Joint Committee's favorable report is accepted,  
 and the bill as amended is passed.

THE CLERK:

Turning to Page 4 of your Calendar...Page 4 of your  
 Calendar, Calendar No. 805, File 470, Substitute S.B. 224, an  
 Act concerning an appropriation for a statement to State em-  
 ployees summarizing employee benefits. As amended by Senate  
Amendment Schedules "A" and "B". Favorable report of the  
 Committee on Appropriations.

RICHARD A. DICE:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark on acceptance and passage?

RICHARD A. DICE:

Mr. Speaker, the Senate Amendment was Schedule "A"  
 and "B", and I move rejection of Senate "A".

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk please call Senate "A".

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A". L.C.O. No. 2354.

MR. SPEAKER:

Gentleman care to summarize Senate "A"?

JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS

ENVIRONMENT

1974

13

ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING

February 21, 1974

mfh

East Lyme

Each year, the Governor of Connecticut cites a local aquarium society for the work it does in conservation and education. 5127 strikes directly at such groups and impedes the good work that they do. I trust that the Committee on environment will work with interested persons commanding the greatest expertise in the pet field; members of aquarium societies and pet shop owners for instance, and attempt to learn some of the difficulties in enforcing--and the economic and moral hardships caused by passing--an Act as outlined in 5127. Submitted by Don S. Johnson of Norwalk.

SENATOR COSTELLO: Thank you sir. Are there any questions?

MR. SETH WAKEMAN: I am Seth Wakeman, 329 High Street, Mystic, Connecticut, and I wish to speak on Bill 217, an Act concerning commercial fishing in inland and marine waters. A number of us lobstering (I am a part time lobsterman myself) realize that the laws of the State in this regard need clarification and improvement. I feel that our Conservation Officers do not do an adequate job with the present laws and we feel that they should have help, as well as the lobstermen.

Basically the Bill as drafted here is still to me quite confusing. The language is not with the proper clarity for those people who must be engaged in using the results of this legislation. Any clarity that can be drawn into it would be appreciated. In the general comment, I am somewhat confused about the license fees. They are drawn in various types and places throughout the Bill.

It is my opinion and several of my compatriots, that there should be one fee for commercial fishing and that all affiliated actions underneath it should be allowed with this rather than having a specific license for one thing, and then adding on various things. It seems somewhat confusing and I think the added fee was suggested which is an increase of, I hate to think of the percentage from five dollars to one hundred dollars is quite adequate to take care of this.

Specifically for comments and for clarity, I would make comment to a few things by line. Lines 107 talking about the marking of live cars or devices in which lobsters are kept, I would have added after, branded or carved thereon. Again on line 118 where it also talks about marking lobster pots, I would say a catching of lobsters should be suitably identified by having legibly branded or impressed in the ballast on the bottom of the pot. This marking is the standard way of marking.

14

ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING February 21, 1974

mfh

East Lyme

Additionally on page 7, line 185, a rather interesting thing, talking basically I believe on the shad fishery. And after 185 it says talking about a mesh less than two and one-half inches square and the use of monofilament gill nets shall be prohibited. I would like to include, at that point, for the taking of shad. Many of us use gill nets for the bait fishery of manhaden and it seems the use of monofilament gill nets shall be prohibited should be better clarified. Gentlemen, I thank you.

SENATOR COSTELLO: Seth, do you have those written out?

MR. SETH WAKEMAN: No I don't. I have marked on my copy.

SENATOR COSTELLO: Could I impose upon you?

MR, SETH WAKEMAN: You may.

SENATOR COSTELLO: Thank you. I can't read the last name. Priscilla? someone--Mott - excuse me.

PRISCILLA W. PRATT: Mr. Chairman, my name is Priscilla W. Pratt and I reside at 75 Front Street, Noank, Connecticut, and I would like to speak in opposition to Bill 5102 concerning the management of deer. An article in the Hartford Courant last stated that polls of Connecticut school children showed the deer to be the strong favorite of the youngsters in their preference for a State Animal.

The General Assembly's Government Administration and Policy Committee last Friday approved a Bill naming the deer the State Animal. At a time when so many wish to honor this animal, the deer is the subject of the Bill #5102 which open up State Lands and private lands, with the landowners permission, to the hunting of deer with firearms in addition to the already allowed bow and arrow hunting. The clumsy and crueler practice of using sports hunting as a way of game management, in this case involving antiquated weapons, such as muzzle loading guns and bows and arrows is becoming increasingly obnoxious to the general public. The excuse is often given that hunting benefits the animals by thinning out the surplus.

But how can a sportman know what animals should be thinned out and what not. The trophy hunter takes the best specimens. Nature does just the opposite and insures the survival of the fittest so that stock remains vigorous and strong. The danger to the general public of taking a walk in the woods during the hunting season is in itself a valid objection to the sports hunters' provisions of this Bill. If it is

62cap  
Thursday

## ENVIRONMENT

March 14, 1974

TOM HARDIMAN CONTINUED:

A bill 277 although we are not really in the lobster business we did have a vote on this bill and we voted to oppose it. The members thought that it might hurt the small lobster man more than it would the big ones.

And bill number 256 establish a natural bed in the Husotonic River. We wish to voice our support for this. We feel that with large existing beds in the areas and this bed has been left dormant for many years. It was a company bed at one time but it reverted back to the State when the company ceased operation.

And there is one other bill we wanted to talk about was bill 278, not 278, 5506. This is a bill concerning 50 cent tax per bushel, on oysters taken out of the State. Although this bill appears that it may help the natural growth beds a quite a bit with the money that is going to be turned over to it, the membership voted against it because we feel that this may stop an outside buyer from coming into the State.

With 50 cents a bushel it is kind of high and we work in Stratford right now we have 30 cents a bushel tax for a converstation program and if we sell something from the Stratford River out of state we are going to end up with 80 cents a bushel on this. So there are good points in this bill but we felt that at the time that 50 cents is going to be a rough thing to handle, for us. The larger companies will or may be able to handle it but it may be a little too high for us to handle. Thank you.

SEN. GUNTHER: On the bill relative to the fishing inland and the marine waters relative to the lobster is it primarily on the fee itself that you have the objection other than the fee?

MR. HARDIMAN: Well mostly the fee and some of the fellows voiced the opinion against the blue shell crab, \$10 for a special license for that.

SEN. GUNTHER: But actually it is primarily the lobster fee. I want to say that there is a question that that was a misprint, very frankly and right now they are redrafting that to have it conform to the New York fee. Which is I believe either \$25 for a State license and \$50 out of State. It is within that, is that right? There is a redraft going on that. That was apparently

63cap  
Thursday

## ENVIRONMENT

March 14, 1974

SEN. GUNTHER CONTINUED: an error in drafting. So with that objection off of it with, do you think that that would leave the objection that the group had.

MR. HARDIMAN: I think quite possibly that we could live with \$25 rather than \$100.

SEN. GUNTHER: Cause a \$10 fee is not a helluva lot for Blue Crabs is it?

MR. HARDIMAN: Not for me.

JOHN BRINKLY: My name is John Brinkly. I'm speaking for the Bridgeport Conservation Commission, Department. I'll take the bills in order as they appear here on the list.

Bill 5506 involving the 50 cent tax on oysters that go outside of the State. Bridgeport Conservation group opposes the bill. We feel it would be a restriction at this time on the development of the oyster industry by the small oystermen. And furthermore we feel that actually this bill should not come out of Committee. We feel that you people are busy, our State Legislature is busy, and our courts are busy and I think it is quite apparent that the bill would be unconstitutional to begin with. It is a unlawful restraint of interstate commerce. There was a case decided in 1928 and we want to have some of your constitutional attorneys refer to it, the case is the Foster Packing Company vs. Heisel.

This is a case where the State of Louisiana wanted to prohibit the exportation from the State of Louisiana of unprocessed shrimp. They were going to Biloxie Mississippi where they were being processed and just as Justice Taft at that time declared that such restraint at that time was unconstitutional. And we feel that this would also apply to the 50 cents tax on oysters going out of the State.

As Mr. Hardiman commented there are some good points in the bill. I know some of the oystermen felt that the tax itself wouldn't be as bad if it were applied to all oysters taken in the State under those grounds that it might be constitutional.

We feel it would not be as written at the present time.

To go to bill 255 the Bridgeport Conservation group approves the idea of the allocation of \$10,000 to

64cap  
Thursday

## ENVIRONMENT

March 14, 1974

JOHN BRINKLEY CONTINUED: a for a program to help develop the oyster industry in Bridgeport natural beds. We do hope that there could be some planning. We understand that last year an equal amount was spent, roughly \$10,000 worth of shell were put down and with what we get from the oystermen, the harvest was not very good because of the fact that the starfish came in and got the young oysters. So we hope that with that there will be some alarming program to make sure that the culture is put down and the set that there to it will be protected so that the oystermen will get something out of that.

On bill 256 the Bridgeport Conversation group approves of the idea of the making of natural oyster beds, beds that formerly were franchised.

On bill 277 we also opposed that because of what seemed to be too high a fee on the lobsters. I also wondered on the question of the \$300 tax on the, no doubt that that is the fair, perhaps it could even be higher on the large commercial boats that come and take millions of pounds. I wonder if that is the Menhaden, that is the small commercial fisherman who is catching Menhaden to sell as live bait or frozen bait. If local fishermen would be included in that, or will he come under the license for the taking of bait for commercial fishing?

SEN. GUNTHER: I can't answer that.

JOHN BRINKLY: Well I think that should be cleared in the bill and a difference made between the person taking the Menhaden on a very large scale. 78 and we opposed that. We feel that it would again be a restriction on the possible development of new shellfishing activity for the oystermen who want to go in for clamming. We feel that also would be unconstitutional.

Justice as I referred to before said a State is without power to prevent privately owned articles of trade from being shipped and sold in interstate commerce on the ground that they are required to satisfy local demands or because they are needed by the people of the State. That would cover it. Thank you.

SEN. GUNTHER: Pardon me, Mr. Brinkly, I'd like to call your attention to 278, the grounds for this restriction is of the health laws not on the restriction of trade. Actually it is in contaminated waters, you know this? And I can't see if you are talking again about a situation

66cap  
Thursday

## ENVIRONMENT

March 14, 1974

SEN. GUNTHER: Well we go down that path a gain about once single companies and about all the noble people that would not dump them into commercial market and I'm afraid you've got a lot more confidence in the ordinary honest people in this world who could pick this stuff up and dump it in the market and have a ballgame frankly.

I think the intent of the law is under the health restriction, very frankly.

REP. OSLER: I was just going to make a comment, Rep. Osler, that down in our area in Greenwich the boats come over from Long Island, they moonlight clam dig at night. And take them back to the New York City market and sell them from contaminated waters where shellfishing isn't permitted. So something is needed to control that kind of activity.

MR. BRINKLY: Well they are breaking the law, from the time they take those clams to begin with. It is not taking them into New York City that is the violation of the law. What they are trying to prove is that that they came from Connecticut anyhow. So the enforcement there is to keep them from poaching the clams from the beginning.

SEN. GUNTHER: The next speaker is Edward Zuluski.  
All Gernatti, Ernie Nagy. Kay Williams.

KAY WILLIAMS: I got no beef with the oystermen tonight I don't know why they must have jumped on the lobster men. Kay Williams, Bridgeport, Connecticut, commercial lobster man. You got a couple of bills, bill 277, I believe it is line 126, 129 and 82. Lobster mutilation. It is almost a must that this bill get passed. To stop lobster mutilation. And then you've got the retail lobsters. The retail outlets which under this bill would have to retain a license to sell lobsters.

And non residents would, an out of State license landing lobsters in Connecticut, in other words if a fellow were to lose a license in Connecticut he could lobster fish in New York State with a New York license and land them here. So I'm all in favor of the bill 277.

And as far as the fee, I think that there is a misprint I think it should be higher, not as far as Blue Crabs they can find and have all the Blue Crabs they want.

67cap  
Thursday

## ENVIRONMENT

March 14, 1974

KAY WILLIAMS CONTINUED: But the lobster fee for commercial fishermen could stand to be higher. That's it.

SEN. GUNTHER: You are a lobster man aren't you.

SEN. SMITH: Is there anyone else interested in testifying on the shellfish bills?

CHARLES BETTS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee my name is Charles Betts, appearing in Connecticut, commercial fisherman, lobster, and I'd like to support this bill 277.

SEN. GUNTHER: You are a commercial lobsterman too are you?

SEN. SMITH: Thank you. Next we go to is House Bill 5704 an act concerning the establishing of West Rock Ridge State Park. First on the list Olive LeRoy.

OLIVE LE ROY: Olive LeRoy of Woodbridge, again speaking as Conservation Chairman of the Federated Garden Clubs of Connecticut. I endorse bill 5704 and respectfully request that it be approved by the Committee on the Environment. The greatest wealth of our state lies in its unspoiled beauty which is made available to the people for their enjoyment through the State Park system. West Rock Ridge would be a magnificent addition to this system. It is already accessible through Baldwin drive along the summit, and the Blue Trail for walking. No more valuable use could be made of this land than its preservation for open space which will dwindle as our State's population grows. The Ridge is in area rich in native plants and animal life, a wildlife laboratory for the natural scientist and a study area for the geologist. This bill would guarantee that the magnificent vistas cliffs, and slopes of West Rock Ridge would always be available for the people of Connecticut to enjoy.

SEN. SMITH: Mrs. LeRoy I have one question? On what Town is the majority of this land fall under? Is it Hamden or Woodbridge or New Haven or is it a combination of the three?

MRS. LE ROY: Yes it is a combination of four towns, New Haven, Hamden, Bethany, and Woodbridge.

SEN. SMITH: Thank you. Tony Kozzenza.