

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-14		5765	3	2	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Environment</i> 7 • <i>Environment</i> 43-44 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 604-605 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 561-562

H-109

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 2
449-973**

Tuesday, March 9, 1971 7.

RONALD A. SARASIN:

EFH

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to our rules, I wish to add a Resolution for tomorrow's Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please proceed.

RONALD A. SARASIN:

The Resolution which is expressing sympathy on the death of Louis Slavkin, sponsored by Rep. Willard, of the 15th.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Hearing none, so ordered, and this item will be taken up on the Consent Calendar under suspension tomorrow.

THE CLERK:

Page 2 of the Calendar. FAVORABLE REPORTS. Calendar 36. Substitute for H.B. No. 5765. An Act concerning redemption of impounded dogs. In your file, No. 11.

EDWARD L. IWANICKI:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark.

EDWARD L. IWANICKI:

Mr. Speaker, when the owner or the keeper of any such impounded dog fails to redeem such dog within 24 hours of notification, the owner, such owner or the keeper, shall pay in addition the sum of five dollars and the cost of advertising, the sum of

Tuesday, March 9, 1971 8.

two dollars per day, or part of a day. Such a dog has been impounded longer than a 24-hour period.

EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Bill. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Those opposed. Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 44. H.B. No. 6109. An Act validating and confirming certain real property transfers concerning Construction and General Laborers' Union, Local No. 230. File 38.

GEORGE W. HANNON, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, may Calendar No. 44, H.B. No. 6109, File No. 38, be passed, retaining its place on the Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 49, H.B. No. 5712. An Act concerning damages for injuries sustained on State highways or sidewalks. File No. 20.

JOHN A. CARROZZELLA:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

JOHN A. CARROZZELLA:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill. It just substitutes one word or two words in writing to the present notice

S-77

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1971

VOL. 14

PART 2

474-956

March 17, 1971

20

THE CHAIR:

SHearing no further remarks all those in favor of the passage of the bill signify by saying aye. AYE. Those opposed nay. The vote in the affirmative and so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Bottom of the page, Calendar No. 69, File No. 17, Favorable Report Joint Standing Committee on the Environment. Substitute H.B. 5765 An Act Concerning Redemption of Impounded Dogs.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Pac.

SENATOR PAC:

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on the acceptance of the Joint Committee's Report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

SENATOR PAC:

This bill provides that if an owner of an impounded dog fails to reclaim his dog within twenty-four hours after being notified or if an unknown owner of a dog fails to redeem him after being properly notified by a newspaper advertisement, a fee of \$2 a day will be charged in addition to the redeeming or reclaiming fee of \$5. It seems that some of our local dog K-9 control Corps are in trouble. Financing is a problem. Costs of dog food is going up so I think we should get out of the business of dog sitting.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on the passage of H.B. 5765. Will you remark further?

March 17, 1971

21.

Hearing no further remarks all those in favor of this bill signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay. It is a vote in the affirmative and the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Page 3, top of the Calendar No. 70, File No. 40. Favorable R^Eport Joint Standing Committee on General Law on H.B. 5841 An Act Validating Notice of Peter J. Karas To The City of Norwich.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Strada.

SENATOR STRADA:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the Joint -Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on the acceptance of the Joint Committee's report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

SENATOR STRADA:

Mr. President, this bill validates a defective notice to the city of Norwalk given on Feb. 2, 1971. With respect to injuries sustained on February 5, 1970. Again on an allegedly defective sidewalk. Suit was brought within the Statutory period. And I urge passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage of the bill No. 5841. Will you remark further? Hearing no further remarks, all those in favor of passage of this bill signify by saying aye. AYE. Those opposed nay. The vote in the affirmative. The bill is passed.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

ENVIRONMENT

**PART 1
1-338**

**1971
Index**

- Sen. Pac Thank you. Anyone else speaking in favor of H.B. 5271 & 5272? ~~Any~~ Anyone opposed to it? Either of these two bills. In that case the testimony is closed on those two bills. We'll now move up to H.B. 5396. This is an act concerning roaming dogs. Anyone speaking in favor of this bill? 5396. No one to speak in favor of this? Anyone to speak in opposition? We'll move onto the next one, H.B. 5397. An act concerning impounded dogs.
- Lewis Gillette Assistant Chief Canine Control Department of Agriculture Natural Resources. I would like to go on record as being opposed to this bill for the simple reason if this bill is not to pass it would eliminate the fee, a local warden's fee of five dollars which they receive now for impounding stray and lonely dogs.
- Sen. Pac Any questions? There will be no questions, anyone else in favor of H.B. 5397? Anyone opposed to H.B. 5397? We'll continue on to the next bill, H.B. 5538. All those in favor of this bill, an act concerning the licensing of dogs. Anyone opposed to this bill? Testimony is closed on H.B. 5538. We'll go on to H.B. 5452. Anyone in favor of this bill, an act making an appropriation for the for the Connecticut, --we've had this one already, and we've passed it. We'll continue on, H.B. 5764, an act of dogs roaming at large. Anyone in favor?
- Lewis Gillette Assistant Chief Canine Control Department of Agriculture Natural Resources, I would to go on record as being in favor of H.B. 5764.
- Sen. Pac Any questions? No questions. Anyone else in favor of H.B. 5764? Anyone opposed to H.B. 5764? In that case, testimony closed on that bill. We'll move up to H.B. 5765, an act concerning the redemption of impounded dogs.
- Lewis Gillette Assistant Chief Canine Control, Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources. I would like to go on record as being in favor of H.B. 5765.
- Sen. Pac Any questions? There will be no questions. Anyone else in favor of H.B. 5765? Anyone opposed to it? We'll move on the the next bill, H.B. 5766, an act concerning Tuberculin tests.
- Arthur Mandirola Chief Livestock Division, Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources, we have three bills that are dealing with the same situation H.B. 345 & H.B. 5766.

THURSDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 11, 1971

Rep. Ciampi: Rep. Bigos, would you kindly leave that report with us so we can read it over?

Rep. Bigos: Yes, I'd be glad to do that.

Rep. Ciampi: Steven R. Zito.

Mr. Zito: Steve Zito, Assistant Director of Recreation for the Town of Bloomfield. I'm here in favor of H.B. 5758 which establishes a Recreation Advisory Commission. We feel that it is a much needed coordinating body for the state. I am in favor of the bill. Thank you.

Rep. Ciampi: Thank you. K. W. Little.

Mr. Little: Ken Little from Vernon, Connecticut, I'm here in opposition to S.B. 244, which would abolish hunting on both private and state land. I'm a landowner of considerable acreage in Connecticut, and I find nothing objectionable to the hunting that goes on on that land, especially in view of the regulations and so on that are administered by our present State Board of Fisheries and Game. I also served on the Governor's Environmental Policy Committee, serving on both the function and the action committees. I think I attended every single meeting in both New Haven and Hartford. This is the report, and I do not find anything in this report which has anything to do with the abolishment of hunting or fishing in effect to the environment. I'm astounded that this bill even got into this committee. Thank you.

Rep. Ciampi: Thank you. W. K. Myers.

Mr. Myers: W. K. Myers of Cheshire. I want to speak in favor of H.B. 5765, AN ACT CONCERNING REDEMPTION OF IMPOUNDED DOGS and H.B. 5764, ACT CONCERNING DOGS ROAMING AT LARGE, and against S.B. 132. In Cheshire there is nothing in the dog laws against ownership of dogs. In Cheshire for four years we every week had two people bitten with dogs, mostly children, and four dogs who were killed on the highway, and it certainly is necessary to use some control over them. Nothing is such a great general nuisance in the suburbs and other places as roaming and untended dogs. H.B. 5765 increases the amount of money people shall pay for the impounding of dogs. I have found many people who have found that the dog pound was the cheapest place to put a dog when they went on vacation. You know who the dog is, you can't do anything about it, you can't get in touch with them, and they get a week, ten days, two weeks, for \$5.00. It's much cheaper and they get very good care, as they do in any registered kennel, or from any veterinarian. Even at \$2.00 a day, it's cheaper than most veterinarians charge for their dogs, and since dogs, if the law is enforced, the dog department pays for itself, one of the few things in the state and in the town which do pay their own way. And this would certainly help out a great deal, and would penalize

THURSDAY

THE ENVIRONMENT

FEBRUARY 11, 1971

the people who prefer to put their dogs in the Pound instead of paying for taking care of them, or who just pick them up, and you pick up a dog on Friday, and the people want to take a weekend off, so they come and get the dog on Monday or Tuesday. And for the same \$5.00. It's only logical that this bill should be passed. I put one in a couple of years ago, somewhat similar, and it certainly is very, very necessary. Now, H.B. 5764, the principal thing here is that the canine control officer may use a humane trap to catch dogs with. This has come to the fore lately, because I can show you this clipping. We had the Prosecutor and Circuit Courts in Meriden, where I read he had prosecuted other people for doing this, and dogs getting caught in the trap. When his dog gets caught, he says it's all illegal and refuses to prosecute. If we can't have rigid prosecution of violation of the state laws, it's very difficult as a dog warden to enforce the laws and take care of the thousands of complaints. In our town with vigorous enforcement we had, we would get ten or twelve complaints every day, and you just can't keep up with the dog complaints, and with the people who think their dogs should be allowed to run and spoil other people's shrubberies, bite the kids, endanger motor vehicles, or get endangered by motor vehicles by running on the highways; until you get into it, you can't imagine how much work there is to it and how people have very little regard for their dogs when they're not right at hand. They say they want a dog to protect their property, and you pick the dog up a mile away, and it certainly isn't going to protect their property at that time. I am against the Euthanasia bill; because of the weather I couldn't get up here last Friday when I understand you heard it. Because there is a tremendous need for animals for good experimentation, and all experimentation, despite the stories you hear, is taking care of it very well. It is foolish to raise, particularly for, dogs, and the cost, just to be used in experimental work, when there are these thousands of abandoned and unwanted dogs. And they provide a good source of animals for experimental work. When you consider their heart work that is being done for heart disease, infantile paralysis, these things would never have been possible in this length of time, if they hadn't had dogs to do some working on. I see there is another bill which I believe came up last Friday, on arresting owners for dogs doing damage and biting people. At present if a dog owner hit you in the face, he'd be sued for breach of the peace, but if the dog is biting you on the leg at the same time, you can't do anything about it, except arrest the man for a roaming dog. You should be able to arrest the owner of a dog who does damage, who bites people, directly rather than having to do it for roaming dogs. There is certainly a great deal - the whole dog laws are set up for the convenience of the roaming dog, and the owner or the person who is injured by the roaming dogs has very little protection under the present laws, and certainly these would help out a great deal in enforcing the dog laws.

Rep. Iwanicki: May I ask one question? Now the Yale Clinic uses these dogs in these experiments. What would you use in cases of trying to find out these different kinds of diseases? What would you use instead of the dogs?