

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

---

SB 255	PA 613	1963
Agric., Public Health + Safety - 1, 8-13, 99		8
Senate - 2533-2538		6
House - 5566-5568		3

LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE  
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

17 #p.

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2014

JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS

AGRICULTURE  
PUBLIC HEALTH  
AND SAFETY  
—  
AGRICULTURE

CONN.  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY  
1963

AGRICULTURE AND PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

WEDNESDAY 2 P.M.

FEBRUARY 20, 1963

Senator Fred J. Doocy and William F. Hickey, Jr.  
presiding

Members present: Senators: Hickey, Hammer, Hull, Perri  
Representatives: Stoeffler, Reinhardsen, Rose  
Whitbeck, Harris, Clark, Darley, Vadnais, Flanagan  
Turner.

Chm. Doocy: The usual custom is to allow the legislators to speak  
on any of the bills in the beginning.

Rep. Hitchcock: (East Windsor) I introduced HB 3912. Senate Bill 255  
is a duplicate of this bill. and is exactly like the  
bill which was submitted to the 1961 General Assembly  
consequently it must be rewritten to comply with  
Public Act 517, Sec. 21 & 22. These bills are the  
result of a study made by a commission appointed  
by Gov. Ribicoff to revise the dog laws. The bill  
as introduced received unanimous support, with the  
exception of Sec. 22-332 on which there was a minor-  
ity report. I have heard it stated that this would  
make a lot of new jobs and cost the State a great  
deal of money. It will make no jobs that are not  
desperately needed and will not cost the State one  
cent but provides for expansion when needed. Sec. 2  
provides that all the expenses connected with this  
law shall be paid from funds recieved from the dog  
license money which is in the hands of the State  
Treasurer. This money can only be spent as provided  
in the dog laws.  
Many towns find it difficult to get a satisfactory  
dog warden or pound. This bill will provide that  
any two or more con continguous towns may establish  
a regional dog pound and have the Commissioner  
appoint a full time dog warden.  
I have no objection to HB2869 and believe that it  
has considerable merit as long as the money is ex-  
pended for research in dog diseases.  
I wish to register my opposition to SB250 and HB2844.  
I agree research institutions should be licensed and  
inspected. I call your attention to the following  
facts: Small town dog wardens are now on a \$4 fee

Rep. Miller: ( Coventry ) Mr. Chairman, the only reason I'm on my feet is because the people in my town asked me to vote against this bill...not one has asked me to vote for it. Thank you.

Chm. Doocy: At this time we'll proceed with the order of the bills as indicated on our program. SB255 and HB3912 and I would ask Commissioner Gill to speak on it now.

Commissioner Gill: My name is Joseph Gill, I'm the Commissioner of Agriculture and Natural Resources and it is in our Department where we have the responsibility of the enforcement of the Connecticut Dog Laws. According to a survey which I came across recently the most popular literature in the United States covers about three subjects....Abraham Lincoln, dogs and doctors. Humorously, a book about a dog who belongs to Lincoln's doctor would sure be a best seller! I'm sure most of us love dogs and take an interest in their welfare. SB255 and its companion Bill 3912 is the result of the hard work of a committee of just such people. This committee appointed by Gov. Ribicoff studied the dog laws for more than 9 months before reporting its recommendations to Gov. Dempsey on January 24, 1961. These recommendations are included in SB255 AND HB3912. These bills also reflect the long experience and study of many dog wardens and other interested citizens thruout the state who have contributed their effort and time toward revising the dog laws. SB255 and HB3912 if enacted would clarify and improve the existing laws in the following ways: By revising the fee schedule which would provide adequate fees for local wardens for the work they perform. By providing cities with over 25,000 population, that the warden be a member of the police force under the direction of the Chief of Police and have the same tenure as a police officer and that his salary be paid from dog funds. Three, several towns have expressed an interest in the state assuming full control of the local dog problem ..so the committee is suggesting a program which would be voluntary..I stress..voluntary on the part of the town whereby two or more towns may request the department to be placed on a regional program. The wardens and any assistants necessary will be state employees and all dog license money collected by these towns be used to administer this regional program.

Four: by increasing the time for holding impounded dogs from 120 to 168 hours. Five: by raising the cost of redeeming an impounded dog for \$4.00 to \$5.00. Six: by placing tighter control on the construction and maintenance of dog pounds, to insure the humane treatment of impounded dogs. Seven: by providing that license fees be increased to \$3.50 from \$2.10 for males and spade females and from \$5.35 to \$7.70 for females. Eight: by providing the town clerks fees for issuing this license be increased for 35 to 50%. Nine: by providing pet shop licenses should be raised to \$50.00 Kennel licenses remain at \$10.00. Ten: by allowing seeing eye dogs into public places under certain restraint. Eleven: by clarifying the definition of the allocation and use of funds for the care and control of dogs. This bill, Mr. Chairman, has the strong support of our department and it is our hope that this joint committee will see fit to report it favorably for action by the General Assembly. And may I offer the technical facilities of the department of Agriculture...they are available for any research or information in the course of your deliberation with this bill. Thank you. And Mr. Chairman, I'd like at this time to introduce to you a member of the committee appointed by Gov. Ribicoff and who helped rewrite these dog laws and you all know him for the wonderful job he just did in the wonderful dog show just completed in Hartford. May I ask that you recognize Captain George Ford.

Captain George Ford: Some of the previous legislators talked about the smoke and heat that has been generated by this issue and I regret it too. But I'd like to go back to 1950 when the conditions in this state were outrageous and then Gov. Bowles had a resolution introduced in the Senate which was passed by the majority directing a committee of 5 to complete and rewrite the dog statutes of this state. I was named temporary chairman of that committee and the book I hold in my hand is the work of that committee. Following the dog scandals in New Haven county 3 years ago, Gov. Ribicoff took note of what was happening in that county where the dog wardens got out of hand in conspiracy with several private corporation in the matter of impounded dogs and he appointed another committee of eleven gentlemen. That committee as Commissioner Gills says worked

for nine long months without pay. Many hot nights were spent over here in the state office buildings whipping this thing out. I'm glad you're here today and are interested in the happenings and the licensing and control of dogs in Connecticut. We have 160,000 dogs licensed today, away above the 1950 figure. It is significant that we're only destroying 12,000 dogs. For my part I wouldn't destroy a dog if it was possible. I regret to say, I wrote to Mr. Turner Mr. Marcus and Mr. Ives and I asked them as gentlemen not resort to the legislative trick of the last legislature and that was tying the dog pound seizure bill into this omnibus bill and as a consequence the words of the 11 people appointed by Gov. Ribicoff was completely invalidated, by the action of those who would shove into the Governor's desk a dog pound seizure bill because we have delayed getting action this Omnibus bill which we need so desperately. The 77 deputy dog wardens that come out of revision of 1950 have done a tremendous job...conditions have improved in this state. And I'm very sorry to day that some of the representative of humane organization have gone to sleep on this thing. Conditions are improving and we want this revision to go thru this legislation without a tale, without a dog pound seizure bill. Let the dog pound seizure bill stand on its own. But invalidate the work of that commission. And let me leave this final thought with you. It's fundamental and it's inescapable...if there were no unlawful dog owners, if there were no roaming dogs, there would be no population in the dog pounds there would be nothing for these counterparts here today. These modern day grave robbers wouldn't be here today looking for the dogs in the dog pounds if the laws of the state were reformed and I ask for the support for Bill 2844.

Chm. Doocy: We are discussing bills SB255 and HB3912. Anyone else who wishes to speak in favor?

Arthur Slade: (Director of Animal Department of the Connecticut Humane Society) Members of the Joint Committee, I would like to voice our support for this bill which we feel is desperately needed. We can certainly endorse the Commissioner Gill's remarks. I was a member of the committee that wrote this revision and we certainly recommend that this committee and the Legislature give it consideration and support.

Thaddeus Cowell: (Westport, Vice President of the Humane Society of the United States, Connecticut Branch) Our society support and urges favoragle cation of the Legislature this year on SB255 and HB3912.

Attorney Michael Schats: (Hartford) Iam representing the Connecticut Veterinary Association. The association consists of 160 odd practicing verternarians in the state and the association wishes to go on record as being in favor of SB255 and HB3912. Thank you.

J. R. Girard: (Newtown) The reason I ask you gentlemen to identify yourselves with your speeches is because there is a difference with those who live in the city and those who live in the country area. My home up in the woods there is 5 miles cross lots from the Nut House. We need a dog. Now this is what I'm concerned about...the differnce between the \$4.00 and the \$8.00. The best legal attorneys will agree that this is a bonanza for lawyers and our courts are now cluttered up and cases are three years pending. This is not going to help. If I give my dog to a warden or a vet to be put to sleep and he ends up in an experimental laboratory..ther's another court case for you! We had cases in New Haven not long ago where hijackers were selling dogs. A vet told me they identify them with tatoo marks. Anybody in the business of rustling dogs will buy better equipment than the dog wardens or vets can afford. And thisshould be incorporated in this bill. I feel that those people who purchase these dogs shouldbe very specified that they can only buy from duly elected or appointed officals with proper identification and that will eliminate a lot of heartsick and lonesome children and protect a lot of even seeing eye dogs from being hijacked. Let's increase the fees of the dog license so they can't keep them. They don't use foxes or racoons, cause they bite. I want to read this in closing, God knew man's great need for a friend and gave him a dog. Thank you.

Ohm. Doocy: We're asking those in favor of 255 and 3912 to speak on these bills.

Chas. Townsend: (President of the Stamford Animal Shelter). Our shelter favor the adoption of these two bills. The good revision and the work of these committees should be recognized and adopted.

Leo Knupka: (North Branford) Vice President of the Parent Association of Cardiac Children in the State of Connecticut. I'm in favor of SB250 and HB2844. I'm told by doctors who operated on my daughter that these experiments are very much necessary.

Chm. Doocy: May I ask you to confine your remarks at this time to 255 and 3912.

Joseph J. Sankey: (Derby) I heard Senator Pope speak that it was not necessary at this time for these dogs...I for one would like to take exception to that remark. A year ago my grandson was operated on for open heart and for eight and a half years we sweated it out because they told us there was not a thing they could do for him. Thanks to the doctors at Grace New Haven, the boy is very well today. There is nobody going to torture these dogs...these stray dogs will be given much more care and treated better if they were used for research instead of leaving them to lie around and to be hit by cars. I'm pleading with the legislature to adopt the bills.

Chm. Doocy: Anyone else to speak in favor of 255 and 3912? If not we'll hear those in opposition to 255 and 3912.

(Inaudible) The dogs are not here but I found some nice words from two nice little dogs: We know we are not human: we just dogs but we have feelings just like you. We sometimes hurt, we get hungry and thirsty. We can stand those things but please spare us from dissection. You've used us for hundreds of years, millions of us have died in agony that you might find this and that. We've been baked, boiled, crushed and cut and little or nothing has been learned from us. Just to be spared the trip from which no dog ever comes back. There will come a time when we'll be conscience again, we can't tell you then how much we hurt or where, we can only lie in our cages and suffer. Is vivisection really necessary? Can't you mighty men and scientist find some way to help humanity without torturing us? Try please. We did not ask to be born and just ask for what all dogs want, a home and a loving master. Give us a peaceful death. I am opposed to these bills.

Irene Kavula: (Wolcott) I'm here today not to argue with my fellow man, but to help clarify and shed some light on the subject at hand. Many of us are here to speak of those living innocent creatures who cannot speak for themselves. Those beautiful trusting dogs who were created by God just as you and I. I ask each and everyone of you, now to examine your conscience. Could those of you who favor vivisection and the passing of this inhumane bill be cold enough and cruel enough to stand by and watch an innocent animal being cut to shreds with or without anesthesia? Could you in all honesty and truth watch such senseless agony inflicted on such devoted creatures without pity in your heart and soul? without hearing somehow, God's voice telling you that it is wrong? If you truly feel no pity, no kindness than you do not belong in the human race. but to something base and mean and monstrous!

Ohm. Doocy: Excuse me please, this I presume is not in opposition to 255 and 3912. I would question your remarks as being german and if you wish to speak when we get into the other bills, we will allow you.

Irene Kavula: This is a free country and I think I am allowed to speak my piece. This is in conjunction with 255 of which I'm oppose and I'd like to have my say. I ask each of you here to examine your conscience to determine whether these things are right or wrong. The problem of human decency is at stake here not just the passing of a bill in legislature. In authentic medical reports the doctors themselves have stated that these experiments on dogs and cats do not prove anything until they are actually tried on human beings. These are true statements they are not lies. This bill now pending is a thing apart and devoid of any reason with necessity. It is a sadistic evil which must be abolished if we are to progress as human beings and not mad scientists. Don't be ashamed or afraid to be kind. With all reverence, I ask you to examine your conscience and may God guide your choice.

AGRICULTURE

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

WEDNESDAY, 2:00 PM                      FEBRUARY 26, 1963

M. Harding continues: constitute unfair representation for the people. We are filing with Governor petitions though the bill has been out only a couple of weeks containing 1072 names of citizens who have come forward to oppose the two bills and I might say that one of the men with a petition had a doctor accompany him who asked people to sign the petition. He could not sign it himself because he was afraid.

Mr. Turner: Miss Harding, you are quite correct. I did get my degrees at Yale and I did do some research and published - I didn't recall that the address happened to be the residence of Yen , under whom I studied. Are you the Erma Horey that telephoned me two years ago? You told me this last time, it was you aunt then who told me over the telephone, "Why don't they go down and get the bums off the green?" It is the same name and it's you , the lady who sat over here two years ago an the public hearing. You said you are not the person who had telephoned me. You have a large family.

C. Hall: One think I'd like to say,, Dr. Spalding of the Hartford Hospital has said that anyone who is highly upset over losing his pet can go to the Crane Building to see if their pet is there. The idea of the dog being hit by a car isn't exactly funny. My name is Constance Hall and I come from Hartford. I'd also like to say that I have a petition here with about 50 people who are against the Pound/Seizure Bill. May I send it Special Delivery to Governor Dempsey?

Yes

C. Hall: And one other thing, I want to speak to say we are in favor of Senator Doocey's bill, #255; we've read it over. The bills were very, very sparse. It's awfully hard to get one but most of the people that I've talked to did obtain one, did read it over completely and we found about 8 flaws in it - each one of us. We read over Senator Doocey's bill and we liked that. It was a good bill for Connecticut. Thank you.

S 52

CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1963

VOL. 10, PART 7

MAY 28 - MAY 30

2259 - 2624

328.2s

C76pr

s

Leg. Ref.

Vault 3

CONNECTICUT  
STATE LIBRARY

May 29, 1963

114

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 959. File No. 447. Substitute for Senate Bill No. 255. An act amending the laws relating to dogs.

Favorable report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

SENATOR DOOCY:

Mr. President...

THE CHAIR:

Senator from the 4th.

SENATOR DOOCY:

(indistinguishable) commission to revise the dog laws in the State of Connecticut, first introduced in the 1961 session. Mr. President, I have here four pages on each of the sessions of the bill. However, I feel that the bill that was before the Agriculture Committee was in the possession of the committee for a considerable period of time. During that period of time, we indicated to all the members that should there be objections or changes if they wished, we were willing to listen or perhaps make the changes. I do find that there are some that I must subscribe to, and, therefore, Mr. President I ask the Clerk to please read the first amendment we have for this bill.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A".

In subsection (a) of section 26, line 22 strike out the word "showed" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "should have had" and in line 24 of said subsection strike the words

May 29, 1963

115

"as soon thereafter as possible" and substitute in lieu thereof "on the next succeeding business day".

Strike section 17 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "Section 22-346 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof: (a) Any blind person who is traveling who is traveling on a train from one point to another point in this state with a guide dog may keep (his seeing-eye) such dog with him in any coach or pullman car of such trains, And such dog may accompany such blind person to all places of public accommodations or facilities furnished by public buildings, inn keepers, common carriers, elevators, restaurants, hotels, motels, tourist cabins, public places of amusements or resorts, without extra charge, provided such dog shall be in the direct custody of such blind person and shall be wearing a harness and shall be perfectly and properly and safely muzzled and credentials issued by an accredited school of training, shall be presented for inspection upon request. Such blind person shall not be required to obtain any additional room, accommodations or other facility for such dog. (b) Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than one hundred dollars or imprisoned not more than sixty days or be both fined and imprisoned."

SENATOR DOOCY:

Mr. President...

THE CHAIR:

Senator from the 4th.

SENATOR DOOCY:

Mr. President, I move for the adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Any remarks?

SENATOR DOOCY:

Mr. President, I would say that the first part where a correction; the second part is substituting the word "basically guide dog for seeing-eye dog" being a trade name and it should not possibly be used in our rules. I, therefore, move for the adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks? The question is on the adoption of the amendment. All in favor say "aye", "opposed". Adopted.

SENATOR DOOCY:

Mr. President, may we take up the second amendment now?

Mr. President.

THE CLERK:

Senate A mendment Schedule "B".

In section 2, line 7, strike out eleven and insert eight.

In section 9, line 14 and 15, strike three dollars and insert two dollars and ten cents, strike seven dollars and twenty cents and insert five dollars and ninety cents.

In section 26 (e), line 10, strike twenty-four hours and insert forty-eight hours.

SENATOR DOOCY:

Mr. President...

May 29, 1963

117

THE CHAIR:

Senator from the 4th.

SENATOR DOOCY:

Mr. President, this basically is a compromise in effort to consider passage of what we consider a worthy bill. It would be my hope that first we would have been able to have the additional warden and second that the increased fee, we would have been able to pass the increased fee. I say this simply because I feel that earlier we had a bill that stirred up a great deal of discussion and feeling. It is my thought that the proper enforcement of this bill that we have before us can be accomplished by having a maximum amount of people to take care of it, and the funds with which to pay them. However, I think that we can live with the bill. I urge the adoption of the amendment and hope that we can proceed on with the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks? The question is on the adoption of the amendment. All in favor say "aye", "opposed". Adopted.

SENATOR DOOCY:

Mr. President, in all seriousness, I would hope because we have changed to what amounts to in my estimation the words "seeing-eye" for "guide dog", because we have in the first part double changed which we are changing in typing. In the second amendment, we are reverting back to the original fee for dog licensing and we are changing a number eleven to eight. While I would be debating the question Mr. President, I would ask that

May 29, 1963

118

this be considered a technical amendment so that we may move on with the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Any objections to the ruling of this technical amendment?

Senator from the 18th.

SENATOR MARIANI:

Mr. President, it seems to me that in light of the fact that the amendment are amendments that we have all seen and worked on, it seems to me that it might be stretching the point to agree that these are technical amendments. Certainly, it is not stretching the point that they may be considered technical in light of the lateness of the hour and the day of the session. I think it is perfectly alright and I would so ask you to rule.

THE CHAIR:

I shall rule that the amendments are technical and the bill can be considered as amended.

Senator from the 32nd.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, remarking on the bill, first I would like to publicly thank the Senator from the fourth district for his cooperation on these amendments. When the bill first came out of committee, when its original draft before that, it came out of committee, there were several changes which the Senator went along with. The bill as it stands now, I think is a good one and it is something that the State of Connecticut needs and I hope that it will pass unanimously.

May 29, 1963

119

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks?

Senator from the 35th.

SENATOR WELLES:

Mr. President, I hope this bill passes. We have spent a great deal of time on it in trying to give our state the best dog warden possible. I worked on subcommittees and I think that this is a very good bill and should pass.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks? The question is on the acceptance of the committee's report as amended by Schedule "A" and "B". All in favor say "aye", "opposed". Passed.

Senator from the 24th.

SENATOR HULL:

Mr. President, with your permission may we go to Calendar No. 954 please. On page fifteen which was passed temporarily.

THE CHAIR:

Yes.

SENATOR HULL:

The Clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 954. File No. 1121. Senate Bill No. 1355.  
An act authorizing the Town and City of Danbury to enter into a pension plan contract.

Favorable report of the Joint Committee on Cities and Boroughs.

H 73

CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1963

VOL. 10, PART 14  
JUNE 5  
SPEC. SESSION  
JUNE 26  
5362 - 5598

328.2s  
C76pr  
h

Leg. Ref.  
Vault 3

CONNECTICUT  
STATE LIBRARY

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

205  
DMS

of the Chair, the nos have it.

MR. EDDY (NEW HARTFORD)

I doubt the vote and move the vote be taken be roll call.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on the motion for a roll call vote. Will all in favor say aye. A roll call vote has been ordered in the Hall of the House. There will be an immediate roll call vote in the House of Representatives. Will all the members take their proper seats. The question is on a roll call vote on the rejection of Senate amendment Schedule "A", of House Bill No. 4511. If you wish to reject the amendment you will vote yes. If you wish not to reject it, you will vote no. The Chair will repeat the question. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Hartford to reject Senate Amendment Schedule "A" to House Bill No. 4511. If you wish to vote to reject the amendment, you will vote yes. If you wish to vote in effect to keep the amendment, you will vote no. The Chair will unlock the machine. All those voted who wished to do so. The Chair will lock the machine, the Clerk will take the tally. The Clerk will announce the tally. The motion to reject the amendment is carried.

THE CLERK:

Business of the Senate. Favorable substitute report on Senate Committee on Appropriations on Senate Bill No. 255. An Act Amending the Laws Relating to Dogs. (As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule A and B.

MR. EARLE (NORTH HAVEN)

The Clerk has an amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

The Clerk will read the amendment.

THE CLERK:

This is Senate amendment Schedule ---

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

206  
DMS

THE SPEAKER:

Is there any objection to the waiving of the reading of the amendment as it is lengthy?

MR. EARLE (NORTH HAVEN)

I so move, Sir.

THE SPEAKER:

The reading will be waived.

MR. EARLE (NORTH HAVEN)

All this amendment does is to remove the word "to seeing eye" and add the word "guide dog". I move adoption of the amendment.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on the adoption of the amendment. All in favor say aye.  
The amendment is adopted.

MR. EARLE (NORTH HAVEN)

The Clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK:

This is Senate Amendment Schedule "B".

MR. EARLE (NORTH HAVEN)

I waive the reading.

THE SPEAKER:

If there is no objection, the reading of the amendment will be waived.

MR. EARLE (NORTH HAVEN)

This amendment would substitute eight wardens instead of eleven. It would allow the dog fees to remain the same. It would require that notice be forty-eight hours instead of twenty-four. I move adoption of Senate amendment Schedule "B".

Wednesday, June 5, 1963

207  
DMS

THE SPEAKER:

All in favor of the amendment say aye. Opposed. The amendment is adopted.

MR. EARLE (NORTH HAVEN)

I now move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by Senate Amendments Schedules "A" and "B".

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on passage as amended by A and B. Will all in favor say aye. Opposed nay. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calandar #946, File #781, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 954. An Act Concerning State Retirement Rights of Robert Claffey. Favorable report Joint Committee Public Personnel.

MR. PADULA (NORWALK)

I move that we take up Calandar #946, #1004, #1005, and #1149; and I move acceptance of the Committee's favorable report and the passage of the bills.

THE SPEAKER:

Will the gentleman from Norwalk give us the numbers once again.

MR. PADULA (NORWALK)

<sup>HB 4167</sup> <sup>SB 664</sup> <sup>SB 666</sup>  
File #946, #1104, #1105 and #1149. Sub. H. B. 2777

THE SPEAKER:

Is there objection in the House for considering the bills collectively?

MR. SHEA (MERIDEN)

No objection, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Hearing none the question is on acceptance and passage of the four bills.

MR. PADULA (NORWALK)

These are good bills, Mr. Speaker, and I urge their passage.