

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB 5522	PA 35	1969
Agriculture - 11-12	FAY	2
Senate - 858-859		2
House - 927-932		6
<b>LAW/LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE</b> <b>DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY</b>		
		10p

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

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2013

## AGRICULTURE

February 13, 1969

Thursday

Rep. Tiffany, 70th Dist.: One other question sir, about how many companies are interested sir? You also test the fertilizer of Agways.

Paul Wagner: That's right sir.

Rep. Tiffany, 70th Dist.: How about some of these companies that have what we call these satellite plants. Like Agway has a plant in Plainfield, one in Franklin, I guess one in Middlefield. Do you go around to all of these plants or do you take just one?

Paul Wagner: We go to many of the plants. If these plants are retailers we go to them and the results would be reported to that retailing plant and to the Headquarters of the corporation. Two letters go out immediately the samples are completed, one to the retailer and one to the manufacturer. In this case the plant would be acting as a retailer and the people in Buffalo, in New York state, would be the corporation that would be reported to. So they would know immediately. The world becomes more and more, doing business in things they can't see and of course these analyses are the only way out.

Chairman Houley: Thank you very much Mr. Wagner:

Louis Golet, Asst. State Dog Warden, Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources: Mr. Chairman, Honorable members of the Agriculture Committee, I want to appear here today in favor of H.B. 5348, H.B. 5522, H.B. 5250 and H.B. 5349.

If I may comment just briefly on all four of these corrective changes, it will only take me a second or two.

H.B. 5348, Regarding the Licensing and Inspection of Grooming Facilities for Dogs. Under our present definitions, a commercial kennel, means a kennel maintained as a business for boarding and grooming or training and selling dogs. Consequently, what has happened, many of these grooming establishments have gotten away from the commercial kennels and have become home type operations and where they are conducting a similar business as these commercial kennels.

Now we are licensing these facilities at the present time, but in order to provide for proper inspections and permit a set of regulations to be set up, a set of standards, we feel that this change is necessary under this particular statute.

H.B. 5522, regarding the Quarantine of Biting Dogs. The present statute does not provide for the quarantine of any dog which has bit any person on a dog owner's premises. The statute merely states that such warden may make such order as he deems necessary.

## AGRICULTURE

Thursday

February 13, 1969

We feel in this case where a dog is restrained to the owner's premises, according to the law, and should a child wander over onto the premises for instance, and consequently become bitten, that the owner should not be penalized to remove the animal off the premises for quarantine purposes but instead serve out the quarantine on the owner's premises.

Chairman Howley: Are there any questions from the committee on that particular point?

Louis Golet: H.B. 5250, The Restraint or Disposal of Dogs Creating a Nuisance or Disturbance.

Some Court Prosecutors interpret the present Statute to mean that the official, as designated in the present Statute, shall personally observe or hear such Nuisance occurring and this consequently has caused quite a bit of reaction by the local officials. Therefore the requested change would enable the official to appoint an agent, such as a police officer or perhaps the Dog Warden in this case, to go down and observe this particular nuisance taking place, report back to the official and such official shall issue the order.

H.B. 5349, the Redemption of Impounded Dogs: The corrective change here by removing the word "shall be released to" - to be "redeemed by" would make it mandatory for any owner of any dog identified in the pound would be redeemed by the owner. Thereby relieving the pound of incurring any additional Board bills.

Mr. Chairman this is all I have, are there any questions?

Rep. Tiffany, 70th Dist: Yes I have one. Was there a change on one of those bills from "may" to "shall"? Is this necessary also?

Chairman Howley: On 5250, in the middle of the page. They have bracket (may) and placed shall.

Louis Golet: Oh yes! Here again there has been some problems with some officials refusing to make any order concerning the restraint or disposal of such dogs. I believe this is the reason for the change, taking out the permissive word "may" and making it mandatory as "shall".

Rep. Mondani 73rd. Dist.: What if he finds the complaints not justified?

Louis Golet: Well he would also make an order or acknowledge the complaintant that there is no need for such order.

This compels the local official to make some order on the nuisance.

Rep. Mondani 73rd. Dist.: He might rule this originally.

Louis Golet: That's right he can.

S-69

CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1969

VOL. 13

PART 2

447-943

Page 18

April 2, 1969

An Act concerning the Redemption of Impounded Dogs.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Houley from the 35th District.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the favorable report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance of the favorable report and passage of the Bill. Will you remark Senator Houley.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, this simply removes the word release and more properly identifies it as a redeeming, note if you will that such animals being so redeemed, must be duly licensed and there is no changes in the fees.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed. The Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 240, File No. 79. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Agriculture on House Bill No. 5522. An Act concerning the Quarantine of Biting Dogs.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Houley from the 35th District.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the committee's re-

Page 19

April 2, 1969

port and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill. Will you remark Senator.

SENATOR HOULEY:

Mr. President, this simply allows the enforcing officer to quarantine a dog on premises. Heretofore, they were taken from the premises and impounded for a period of some 21 days. Also allows an option of that enforcing officer, depending on the conditions, it's a good housekeeping measure and I urge it's adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed. The Bill is adopted.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 241, File No. 73. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Elections on House Bill No. 5038. An Act concerning Election of Members of the Board of Education and Representative Town Meeting of the Town of Darien.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Caldwell from the 23rd District.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

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

H-96

CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1969

VOL. 13

PART 2

466-992

Thursday, March 20, 1969

27

mec

AYE. Those opposed? The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Calender No. 132. Modified House Bill No. 5349. An Act concerning the Redemption of Impounded Dogs. Favorable report of the Committee on Agriculture. File No. 78.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 73rd.

MR. MONDANI: (73rd)

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. MONDANI: (73rd)

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a clarifying amendment which would now require the owner of a dog impounded to absolutely redeem it and remove any doubt. I urge the passage.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not, the question is on acceptance and passage? All those in favor, indicate by saying AYE. Those opposed? The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 133. House Bill No. 5522. An Act concerning the Quarantine of Biting Dogs. Favorable report of the Committee on Agriculture. File No. 79.

Thursday, March 20, 1969

28

mec

THE SPEAKER:

The Speaker recognizes our expert on the subject of dogs. The gentleman from the 73rd.

MR. MONDANI: (73rd)

I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. MONDANI: (73rd)

Mr. Speaker, this bill would, again clarifying it, allow the dog warden, or deputy dog warden, to permit quarantine of a biting dog on the premises of the owner. Right now there is some, again some doubt on this, and it would carry on the appeal section. It would clear up that provision that when the dog bites on the owner's premises.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 141st.

MR. MCKINNEY: (141st)

Mr. Speaker, I hate to say this, but we are totally confused by this bill. It seems to me to be the most unmanageable bill that we have seen in a long time. I can't determine how you would police the fact that a dog is quarantined or is not quarantined. It is my assumption that when you quarantine a dog because it has bitten a child that you were very concerned that there might be some possibility of rabies, a disease which

Thursday, March 20, 1969

29

mec

if we don't catch within this initial period, we have no cure for. It would seem to me that if we put a dog in home quarantine, we have no way of policing the fact that the children in the house don't let the dog out. I think that frankly it just seems like a very bad bill, because there don't seem to be any ways to police this. I would respectfully request that the gentleman on the other side, because obviously this is no overriding partisan issue, explain to me how he could police this problem. I know that I have two dogs and five small children, and it would be impossible to quarantine a dog in my house, but I would like an answer through you Mr. Speaker to this problem, and maybe we can come to some adjustment on it.

THE SPEAKER:

Does the gentleman care to respond?

MR. MONDANI: (73rd)

In the second portion of the sentence referring to quarantine allows also the commissioner or dog warden to make any order concerning this. I would suspect in the policing of this that if the owner were not able to keep the animal penned up properly, then the quarantine could be required at another place. I think this is what would prevail.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 141st.

MR. MCKINNEY: (141st)

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully say something to this

Thursday, March 20, 1969

30

mec

House. We have had a great deal of problem locally with dog wardens. Our community has had, I believe, four in the period of the last year and a half. Evidently it is not a job that we can easily get people to take. I think this law leaves it far too open. If a dog bites someone, we want to make darned sure that this dog is going to be contained, and contained in a place where we know it is contained, because one person dying from this almost incredible disease, would be too much. The bill is too loose. I don't think this House should pass it.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill? The gentleman from the 118th.

MR. AJELLO: (118th)

Mr. Speaker, I think that having read the bill, I think that it gives to the wardens some flexibility, it is true in the method in which they approach these problems, and I think that probably is just exactly the intent of the committee in bringing it out in this form, and I think further that we must place in this type of instance reliance on the dog warden to make such order as he deems proper, and I think from my own limited experience with the operations of dog wardens, both local and on a state level, that they would take into account the safety of people either in the house, or in the household, in making their order. It gives him the alternative, and of course means less expense to the municipality, or the state, as the case may be, when he can require adequate supervision and restraint on

Thursday, March 20, 1969

31

mec

the owner's premises. I think this is a case where the committee has considered this, and it is for that reason that they are asking for this very flexibility.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? The gentleman from the 151st.

MR. MORANO: (151st)

Mr. Speaker, I think it would solve the problem very easily if we used police dogs.

THE SPEAKER:

Are there further remarks?

MR. MONDANI: (73rd)

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak for the second time.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from the 73rd.

MR. MONDANI: (73rd)

The statute which was originally on the books did not require a quarantine when an animal bit a person on the premises, and I think this is what we were specifically attempting to change here. It now does require quarantine or any other such order as the state warden would request, and I am sure they would have the interest of the public at hand here.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? The gentleman from the 40th.

MR. MAYER: (40th)

Mr. Speaker, I was going along pretty well until I read in the bill itself in the present statute that it says "that if

Thursday, March 20, 1969

32

mec

such warden such warden finds that such person has been bitten, or so attacked by such dog, when such person was not on the premises of the owner or the keeper of such dog, such warden shall quarantine such dog in a public pound or order the owner to quarantine it in a veterinary hospital or kennel." Now the bill and the previous law clearly state that the dog will be quarantined. This allows the quarantine to take place on the owner's premises. It is a bad bill, and it should fail.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? If not, the question is on acceptance and passage. All those in favor, indicate by saying AYE. Those opposed? The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Calender No. 134. Modified House Bill No. 6598. An Act concerning Hunting of Deer. Favorable report of the Committee on Fish and Game. File 80.

THE SPEAKER:

The representative from the 49th.

MR. CALCHERA: (49th)

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

MR. CALCHERA: (49th)

This bill, Mr. Speaker, was introduced at the request