Date: February 9, 2009

To: Senator Meyer
Representative Roy
Senator McKinney
Representative Chapin
Members of the Environment Committee

From: John J. Kriz

Re: ***HB 6313 An Act Concerning Raw Milk***

I am greatly concerned about **An Act Concerning Raw Milk**. This is **Bill# 6313**. This act proposes increased labeling, on farm sales only, and increased testing, which will be funded by the producers rather than the State of Connecticut. That stated reason for this change is to protect the public from the health risks of raw milk. But if this were true, then increased labeling, which the Raw Milk Producers of CT have already agreed is reasonable, would be entirely adequate. At the January 21st meeting of the Milk Regulation Board, the representative for the Department of Public Health said that he wanted to see raw milk made illegal. Just plain illegal. If this act is passed into law, there will soon be no producers of raw milk in CT because they will all be out of business. This hurts our agriculture, local business, family farms and open space.

Inspection of dairy herds for disease is not required for pasteurized milk, because it is assumed that pasteurization will eliminate all sources of infection, but this is not accurate. (The idea seems to be: "We do not care if it's clean. We'll just zap it.") For example, the nation's largest recorded outbreak of *Salmonella* was due to PASTEURIZED milk contaminated with antibiotic-resistant *Salmonella typhimurium*. The outbreak, which occurred between June 1984 and April 1985 sickened over 200,000 and caused 18 deaths. And a 2004 outbreak in Pennsylvania and New Jersey involved multidrug-resistant *Salmonella typhimurium* infection from milk contaminated after pasteurization.

Pasteurization laws favor large, industrialized dairy operations and squeeze out small farmers. When farmers have the right to sell high quality, unprocessed milk to consumers (a wonderful, healthful food; I drink it), they can make a decent living, even with small herds. High quality milk is that which is produced from grass-fed cows kept in clean conditions. Milk produced in this way is both safe, and highly beneficial. Over the past eight years, Organic Pastures Dairy of Fresno, California has sold over 40 million servings of raw milk without one case of illness; during the same period the California Department of Food and Agriculture issued at least 19 recalls of pasteurized milk products. Frequent testing by Organic Pastures, the state of California, and the veterinary departments of local universities has failed to detect even a single human pathogen in their raw milk.

If the health and safety of the public is truly the issue, then consider the overuse and misuse of antibiotics, crowded feedlots, and the low-quality, low-cost feeds that are common elements of industrial agriculture. (Such feeds often include animal manure. Yes, you read that right.) According to Robert Tauxe, CDC Chief of the Foodborne and Diarrhreal Diseases Branch, New food-borne pathogens have emerged from this unclean, industrial food model, and more are expected. Dr. Tauxe also states that food-borne pathogens such as *Campylobacter*, *E. Coli* O157:H7, *Y. enterocolitica*, *Cryptosporidium*, and *Listeria*, have only emerged with in the past twenty-five years. In contrast, the five pathogens which plagued the early decades of the 1900s, when pasteurization was implemented, *Brucella*, *Clostridium botulinum*, *Salmonella typhi*, *Trichinella*, and *V. cholerae*, all combined account for only 0.01% of food-borne illnesses today.

An Act Concerning Raw Milk will do nothing to increase the safety of the public, while simultaneously putting small farmers out of business, and removing a valuable and healthful resource from the food supply. I urge you to reject it.

Regards,

John J. Kriz
1370 Ponus Ridge
New Canaan