

Dear Representative Albis,  
Greetings, hope all is well. I am writing in strong opposition to the de facto ivory ban found in (Raised) S.B. No. 227, An Act Concerning Cecil's Law.

Passage of this Bill would constitute a de facto Ban on ivory, including antiques and musical instruments. This would irreparably harm the preservation, collecting, study, understanding and promotion of Connecticut's history. There is an exemption for possession by museums, but there is no exemption for the trade in antique items. This oversight must be corrected.

The need for a "certificate of possession" from the Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection would seem to be a costly and difficult requirement. What are the conditions necessary to receive this document? And it sounds like this would be for possession only? What about trade in genuine antiques? As written, the legislation seems to be unclear, arbitrary and misleading.

Unfortunately, I highly doubt that any of this legislation would help save any animal living in Africa today, including the African elephant. Please refer to comments provided to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service by Dr. Daniel Stiles, the world's leading scholar in the global ivory market. Dr. Stiles states in no uncertain terms that his research has found a ban in the United States would not help the situation and may actually make the situation worse. I have attached a PDF of his full length comments, a Summary can be found here:

<http://www.regulations.gov/#!documentDetail;D=FWS-HQ-IA-2013-0091-0415>

The USFWS has yet to rule on the Rule Revision and California's ban is being challenged in Court:

<http://www.antiquestradegazette.com/news/2016/jan/15/california-collectors-take-on-the-state-over-ivory-ban/>

I will be at the LOB on Friday and look forward to seeing you there.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best wishes,

Arthur Liverant

Nathan Liverant and Son, LLC  
168 South Main Street  
P.O. Box 103  
Colchester, CT 06415