

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 400 PA 77 1992

House 3349-3350, 3358-3374
(18)

SENATE 1258-1261, 2165-2166
2179-2181 (9)

Env: 1082-1086, 1093-1094, 1135-1136
1140-1148 (18)

45p.

CONNECTICUT STATE LIBRARY
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SECTION

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

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2015

H-632

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1992

VOL. 35

PART 10

3155-3494

tcc

99

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

announcements or points of personal privilege? Clerk,
please return to the call of the Calendar.

CLERK:

Let us turn to Page 4, Calendar 379, substitute for
Senate Bill 400, AN ACT CONCERNING RABIES CONTROL.

Favorable Report of the Committee on Environment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Chairman of the Environment Committee,
Representative Mary Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Thank you Madam Speaker, good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Good afternoon to you Madam.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Question is on acceptance and passage in
concurrence with the Senate. Will you remark Madam?

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Thank you Madam Speaker. The Clerk has an
amendment, LCD2390, if the Clerk would please call and
may I summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

tcc

003350
100

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

Will the Clerk please call LCO2390, which shall be designated House Amendment "A".

REP. FRANKEL: (121st)

Madam Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Frankel.

REP. FRANKEL: (121st)

There appears to have been a problem in the numbering of this amendment. Until the Clerk can locate it in his stack, I'd move this item be passed temporarily.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Motion is to pass this item temporarily. Without objection, so ordered.

CLERK:

Page 16, Calendar 214, substitute for House Bill 5793, AN ACT PROHIBITING INSURANCE COMPANIES FROM DESIGNATING REPAIR SHOPS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE REPAIRS.

Favorable Report of the Committee on Insurance and Real Estate.

REP. LYONS: (146th)

Madam Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Lyons.

REP. LYONS: (146th)

tcc

108

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Bill is passed. (gavel)

CLERK:

Calendar 379, Page 4, substitute for Senate Bill 400, AN ACT CONCERNING RABIES CONTROL.

Favorable Report of the Committee on Environment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Mushinsky, let's try again.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Try again Madam Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Question is on acceptance and passage in concurrence with the Senate. Will you remark Madam?

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Thank you. The Clerk now has amendment LCO2390, if the Clerk will please call and may I summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Will the Clerk please call LCO2390, which has been designated House Amendment "A".

CLERK:

LCO2390, designated House Amendment "A", offered by Representative Tulisano, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

003359

109

tcc

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

The lady has asked leave of the Chamber to summarize. Without objection, please proceed Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Thank you Madam Speaker. This amendment makes several corrections to clarify and tighten up the language of the bill. I move adoption of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Motion is on adoption of House "A". Will you remark? Will you remark Madam? Will you remark further on this amendment? Will you remark further? Representative Tiffany.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Thank you Madam Speaker. Through you, I would ask the proponent of the amendment if they have a fiscal note on the amendment?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

If the Chair would give me a minute, I will obtain it. Madam Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

tcc

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

The fiscal note is stamped, potential minimal municipal cost. If there is a need for municipality to hire a private vet to make a determination. The exact impact cannot be determined.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Tiffany.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Thank you Madam Speaker. I will reserve my comments for the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Thank you sir. Will you remark further on this amendment? Will you remark further on this amendment?

REP. COLLINS: (117th)

Madam Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Collins.

REP. COLLINS: (117th)

Thank you Madam Speaker. I would like to ask the Chairman of Environment, if she might, for legislative intent, give a description to the change on Line 207, which is says A GOOD HOME. That seems to be somewhat ambiguous term to me.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Madam Chairman?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

tcc

111

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Madam Speaker, through you, we simply copied existing language for the placement of dogs, it's in the statutes, it's already, and it is in common usage.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Will you remark further on this amendment? Will you remark further? If not, let us try your minds.

All those in favor, please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted (gavel) and ruled technical. Will you remark further on this bill as amended?

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Madam Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

The Clerk has another amendment, LC03454, if the Clerk would please call and may I summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Will the Clerk please call LC03454, will shall be designated House Amendment "B".

tcc

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

CLERK:

LCO3454, House "B", offered by Representative Prelli, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

The lady has asked leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there objection? Seeing none, please proceed Madam.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Thank you Madam Speaker. This amendment adds other animals to Line 116, thereby, extending the current exemption from criminal or civil liability for killing a biting dog, to kill any other animal. I move adoption of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Will you remark? Will you remark further on this amendment? Motion is on adoption of House "B". If not, let us try your minds again. All those in favor, please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Opposed nay. The ayes have it. (gavel) Amendment is adopted and ruled technical. Will you remark further on this bill as amended by House "A" and "B"? Will you remark further?

tcc

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Thank you Madam Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

This bill is intended to provide additional protection against rabies, which is now epidemic in Fairfield County and has spread as far east as Southington. It's important that we give our public officials the ability to deal with this public health crisis. The bill extends the rights of a person to defend themselves from attack by any animal, whereas existing law, we had limited this right to attacks by dogs. It also expands the powers to quarantine animals beyond dogs. It allows for the owner of an animal quarantined, because of a biting attack to authorize the Humane Euthanization of a Quarantined Animal, if the animal is clinically diagnosed as being rabid.

This way we can put the animal out of its misery quickly. The bill establishes standards for the disposition of an animal, which is quarantined and unclaimed by its owner. Existing law already establishes standards for the disposition of dogs. And finally, the bill authorizes the killing of wild animals, by animal control, canine control and police

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

officers if they reasonably conclude that the animal is rabid. This new language will protect these officers who will be coming in contact with rabid animals from potential attacks by these animals.

It's an important public health measure and I hope you will support it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Thank you Madam. Will you remark further on this bill as amended? Representative Tiffany.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Thank you Madam Speaker. I was troubled by this bill at the time of the public hearing. And while I would indeed agree that there is a public health threat and we need some legislation, I am somewhat saddened that this bill is in not better shape than it is. The last few days, I have been negotiating or talking with the department about the bill. Madam Speaker, pointing out what I feel are a number of deficiencies and discrepancies in the file.

Unfortunately their response has been, generally, trust me, I'm from the government and I'm here to help. I guess probably I should. On the other hand, my long experience here in the Halls of the General Assembly, I know full well that we always save the best for last. And that only good and clearing legislations gets

tcc

115

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

passed in the final days of the General Assembly Session. In my opinion, this bill in the guise of public health and safety, does rampant injustice to some personal rights.

And perhaps, Madam Speaker, I can point some of these deficiencies out. And if anybody in the Chamber does get back here next Session, they will make an attempt to clean it up. Perhaps, through you Madam Speaker, I could ask some questions and again, either raise some questions in some others minds or perhaps allay some of the fears in my mind. And through you Madam Speaker, I would ask the Chairman of the Environment Committee, whether or not there's anywhere any definition in the Statutes what a bite consists of?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Through you Madam Speaker, I don't know.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Tiffany.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Thank you. Let me point out what I feel is perhaps some overkill in this particular bill. I don't think the issue is quite as simple as bracketing the word DOG and putting in OTHER ANIMAL. There's a fairly long

tcc

003366

116

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

history, case history in law about the bites of dogs. And I'm not sure we can transfer that entire case history to other animals. What you've done, you've lumped carnivores, which are dogs in with vegetarians. And I'm not sure that a bite of a vegetarian is as dangerous or as life threatened of a vegetarian irumina.

And, another question, through you Madam Speaker, is there anywheres in the Statutes defined what an ANIMAL is?

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Through you Madam Speaker, yes there is. And I would also comment that an herbivorous bite would be as dangerous as a carnivore bite as the rabies virus is carried in the saliva. Remember that rabies is a 100% fatal disease and we don't want to take chances with this. We do want to protect the public health.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Tiffany.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

I would ask, through you Madam Speaker, what the definition of an animal is. In the LOR Report, it refers to brute creatures. I guess I've been called a

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

brute creature at various times. Perhaps I've even been called an animal.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Not you Representative Tiffany.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

In my younger days Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Oh, okay. (laughter) Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Through you Madam Speaker, the law defines as animals as all brute creatures, including birds and reptiles.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Therein lies one of my dilemmas, Madam Speaker. We're covering, we're going from a statute that involves roughly 1/2 million animals. There's roughly, I've been told, 1/2 million of dogs in the State of Connecticut to countless, hundreds of thousands of animals that fall in that definition. Many of which do not even, are not susceptible, do not carry rabies. And I am perplexed why we would include birds and reptiles in this, Madam Speaker, if they cannot contact rabies. Through you, I would ask the Chairman of the Environment Committee.

As I understand it, this also includes birds and

tcc

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

there are literally millions of birds in Connecticut. Why is not the definition of animals in this more strict? More closely defined as those animals which carry rabies? Through you Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Through you Madam Speaker, the intent is to make it as wide as we can, to not miss any animal. Now if rabies is not, in fact, carried by birds, then it will not become a problem. There won't be a rabid bird worrying a child or a domestic animal. It won't come up as a problem. There won't be any reason to euthanize the bird. The rabies has spread beyond the original racoons and foxes, in which it came into Connecticut. It is now found in sheep and it is now found in deer. It's even a threat to hunters who are out dressing deer. They're now being advised to wear gloves when they dress the carcass. So it is spread to other animals beyond the traditional carriers, and we'd like to make the law as broad as we can to cover all the potential carriers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Representative Tiffany.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

tcc

003369
119

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

Madam Speaker, I would agree but I would call your attention to Line 18, where it says any person who is bitten by any animal may kill such animal, whether or not it's rabbit or not. And I'm not sure, Madam Speaker, that we should give everyone the license to kill any animal that bites, provided it's off the owners property. Let me give you an example. I think it was last Monday, I was driving to Hartford, and as you know, many of you know, on Route 85 in Salem, Dr. Barrett has a fairly large equine practice. And some of the horses had broken out of the lot and were running up and down 85.

And being a farmer, I stopped and helped him catch his horses. The point I'm making, if those horses were off the owners property, if one of those horses nipped me, I would, if this bill had passed, been in my right to pull out a 45 and shoot the horse on site. I'm not sure we ought to be doing that. I would further indicate, that the bill says, that if the horse did nip me, the animal control officer in Salem must, and I reiterate the word MUST, quarantine that horse. I'm not sure, Madam Speaker, that the animal control officer in Salem is in a position to house quarantine horses.

Going on, as I have lots of rural people in my district

tcc

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

and I'm sure I'm not the only one in Connecticut that has some rural areas. There's lots of farmers, indeed not only farmers but other people that have some chickens, or some geese, some ducks. Let's say, and these are allowed to roam on the farm or the backyard or whatever, that a duck or a goose with its little one, as you know, goes across the road. A good Samaritan stops his car and tries to shoo them out of the road. Again, the gander takes offense to this and bites the individual.

Again, that individual is, by this statute, allowed by kill that goose. In addition, if he doesn't, he must report the incident and the animal control officer must quarantine that animal. I frankly, don't think that the bill is a bit broad. As again, as I'm saying, in the name of public health and safety. Again, I would say, that I think with the first amendment that passed, we've taken the MAY out on Line 19, and made it SHALL. Which in my opinion means that the bills are supposed to be mandatory. And that means that any person that's every bitten by an animal, and we have now got a vary broad definition of animal, must report that attack to the chief canine control officer.

The chief canine control officer must fill out a complaint and a number of other things. And again, it

tcc

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

says the officer shall quarantine such animal if the bite occurs off the owners property. I think, again, it's overly broad in my opinion. And, I would, skipping over to page 5 of the file, I was, I'm somewhat troubled by Subsection B, which allows an animal to be killed without the owners knowledge and I guess Representative Tulisano is in the Chamber. I would ask, through you Madam Speaker, it says no person that kills any animal or in accordance with a subsection be held either criminally or civilly liable thereof.

Madam Speaker, it is well known that the only way you can positively identify whether an animal or not has rabies is through examination of the brain cells. And what if somebody goes around and starts killing animals. And some of these animals prove not to be rabid. I suspect that someone has got to be either criminally or civilly liable. Would the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee care to comment on that? Through you Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

He's got a big smile on his face. I think he would care to. Representative Tulisano.

REP. TULISANO: (29th)

Through you Madam Speaker, the way the bill is

tcc

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

written, there is absolutely, absolute immunity. It doesn't even have good faith effort in there, standard. So there will be people who, in any other kind of case, probably would otherwise be compensated. But in this situation, would not be. Thank you Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Thank you sir. Representative Tiffany, you still have the floor.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Thank you. I find that indeed, troubling. And I suspect there will be some lawsuits involved. And this isn't that far fetched. Let me give you an example, perhaps we can be humorous, perhaps not. But we've heard a great deal of Representative Mordasky farm, and that fact that it's located near the town dump in Stafford. Somebody finds a racoon in the town dump in Stafford, they kill it, it's sent to Hartford and it's found to be rabid. They go back and check, sure enough, there's racoons on Representative Mordasky's silage pile. So they quarantine the entire herd.

It doesn't even say, it just says, ah shucks, in contact with. So they quarantine the herd, they go back to check, a few days later, there's a dog that's been chasing some of his heffers around, there blowing, there perhaps salivating at the mouth, and they look

tcc

123

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

like they may be rabid. They go in there and start laying away these heffers when John is up here in Hartford attending and Environment Committee Meeting. How ironic, how ironic. And they can do it without any penalty. Madam Speaker, again, I supported the bill in the Environment Committee and I'll probably vote for it again today.

But believe me, if a bill ever needed further cleaning up, it's this, it's this bill. It's just horrendous. I'm not sure whether or not people would be considered animals in that very broad definition of animals. If this is the best we can do, it's a sad day. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Thank you sir. Will you remark further on this bill as amended? Will you remark further on this bill as amended? If not, will all members please take their seats. Staff and guests to the well of the House. The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. Members to the Chamber please. The House of Representatives is voting by roll, members, kindly report to the Chamber.

tcc

House of Representatives

Monday, April 27, 1992

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Have all members voted and is your vote properly recorded? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 400 as Amended by House "A"

and "B"

Total Number Voting	146
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	145
Those voting Nay	1
Those absent and not voting	5

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Bill as amended is passed. (gavel) Representative Frankel.

REP. FRANKEL: (121st)

Madam Speaker, at this time I'd like to move for the suspension of our rules for the immediate transmittal to the Senate for our last item of business.

DEPUTY SPEAKER POLINSKY:

Motion is to suspend the rules for immediate transmittal to the Senate. Is there objection? Without objection, so ordered. Are there any

S-332

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1992

VOL. 35
PART 4
1065-1457

WEDNESDAY
April 15, 1992

001258
120
tcc

36 Yea
0 Nay
0 Absent

The bill passes:

Senator O'Leary.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Thank you, Madam President. I move that that item be transmitted immediately to the House.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. You have before you Senator O'Leary's motion to suspend the rules for the immediate transmittal of that item to the House. Is there any objection? Any objection? Hearing none, the rules are suspended for that purpose. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 210, File No. 267, Substitute for Senate Bill 400, AN ACT CONCERNING RABIES CONTROL.

Favorable Report of the Committee on Environment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. The Chair would recognize Senator Spellman.

SENATOR SPELLMAN:

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

WEDNESDAY
April 15, 1992

001259

121
tcc

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator: Do you wish to remark further?

SENATOR SPELLMAN:

Thank you, Madam President. This bill makes a number of technical changes in regard to canine control. The most important aspect of the bill is that it clarifies the duties and responsibilities of animal control officers to make it clear that their authority to impound and deal as they otherwise would with rabid animals extends to cats.

With the current rabies crisis in the State of Connecticut we unfortunately had a number of circumstances where local control officers have refused to deal with cats and they present a clear and apparent threat to human health from raccoon rabies which can be contracted not only from direct contact with raccoons, but also with cats who have come into contact with raccoons, whereas, most dogs have been vaccinated and I think most cats have not and this is really an emergency situation in the state which I believe is why Senator O'Leary has asked for immediate transferral of this upon passage by the House and I would ask for support from my colleagues in moving this critical public health measure along.

THE CHAIR:

WEDNESDAY
April 15, 1992

001260

122
tcc

Thank you very much, Senator Spellman. Would anybody else wish to remark on Senate Calendar No. 210? Are there any further remarks? If not, I would presume, sir, you would like to have a roll call vote.

SENATOR SPELLMAN:

Yes, Madam President, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, if there are no further remarks, then would you please make the necessary announcement for a roll call vote.

THE CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. The issue before the Chamber is Senate Calendar No. 210, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 400. The machine is on. You may record your vote.

Senator DiBella. Senator Allen. Senator Avallone. Is Senator DiBella about? Have all Senators voted that wish to vote? Have all Senators voted that wish to vote? The machine is closed.

WEDNESDAY
April 15, 1992

001261
123
tcc

The result of the vote:

35 Yea
0 Nay
1 Absent

The bill passes.

Senator O'Leary.

Madam President, I move that that item be transmitted immediately to the House.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator O'Leary. You have before you Senator O'Leary's motion for suspension of the rules for the immediate transmittal of Senate Calendar No. 210 to the House. Is there any objection? Is there any objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered for that purpose. Senator Larson.

SENATOR LARSON:

Madam President, I rise on a Point of Personal Privilege. We're very fortunate today in the Circle to have a guest with us, a very bright and articulate young man who garners most of his intelligence and good looks from his mother and I'm pleased to announce that we have with us today Brian Avallone who is with us and I'd like to have you please rise and give him our traditional welcome.

APPLAUSE

S-334

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1992

VOL. 35
PART 6
1845-2244

WEDNESDAY
April 29, 1992

002165
192
tcc

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Would anyone else wish to remark on Senate Calendar No. 150? Are there any further remarks? If not, would you consider placing this on the Consent Calendar?

SENATOR PRZYBYSZ:

So moved, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Is there any objection to placing Senate Calendar No. 150, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 101 on the Consent Calendar? Is there any objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Page 30, Calendar 210, File 267, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 400, AN ACT CONCERNING RABIES CONTROL. (As amended by House Amendment Schedules "A" and "B").
Favorable Report of the Committee on Environment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Madam Clerk. The Chair would recognize Senator Spellman.

SENATOR SPELLMAN:

Thank you, Madam President. I move passage of the bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

WEDNESDAY
April 29, 1992

002166

193
tcc

Thank you very much, Senator. Would you care to remark further?

SENATOR SPELLMAN:

Thank you, Madam President. The amendments attached by the House are strictly technical in nature and I would move passage in concurrence with those amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Would anybody else wish to remark on Senate Calendar No. 210, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 400? Are there any further remarks? If not, Senator, would you consent to put this on the Consent Calendar?

SENATOR SPELLMAN:

I would so request, Madam President, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Is there any objection to placing Senate Calendar No. 210, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 400 on the Consent Calendar? Is there any objection? Hearing none, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Page 31, Committee on Conference, Calendar 142, Files 43 and 127, Substitute for House Bill No. 5144,
AN ACT CONCERNING FILING DATES FOR APPLICATIONS FOR LIQUOR PERMITS AND THE TIME WITHIN WHICH TO FILE

WEDNESDAY
April 29, 1992

002179

206
tcc

the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. The issue before the Chamber is Consent Calendar No. 1 for today, Wednesday, April 29, 1992. Mr. Clerk, would you please call the items that have been placed on Consent.

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the first Consent Calendar begins on Calendar Page 1, Calendar No. 201, Substitute for Senate Bill 471.

Calendar Page 3, Calendar No. 279, Substitute for Senate Bill 416.

Calendar Page 17, Calendar No. 411, Substitute for House Bill 5029.

Calendar Page 25, Calendar No. 157, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 419.

Calendar Page 26, Calendar No. 240, Substitute for House Bill 5488.

Calendar Page 29, Calendar No. 109, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 99. Calendar 150, Substitute for Senate Bill 101.

Calendar Page 30, Calendar No. 210, Substitute for Senate Bill 400.

Calendar Page 31, Calendar 142, Substitute for

WEDNESDAY
April 29, 1992

002180
207
tcc

House Bill 5144. And Calendar No. 406, Senate
Resolution No. 15.

Madam President, that completes the Consent
Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. You've heard the
items that have been placed on the first Consent
Calendar for today, Wednesday, April 29, 1992. Yes,
Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Madam President, I need to add one more item to the
Consent Calendar, that is on Calendar Page 7, Calendar
No. 330, House Bill 5676.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. You've now heard
all of the items placed on today's first Consent
Calendar. The machine is open. You may cast your
vote.

Senator Fleming. Have all Senators voted that wish
to vote? Have all Senators voted that wish to vote?
The machine is closed.

The result of the vote:

34	Yea
0	Nay
2	Absent

WEDNESDAY
April 29, 1992

002181
208
tcc

The Consent Calendar is adopted.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Upson.

SENATOR UPSON:

Yes, Madam President. The Executive and Legislative Nominations Committee will meet on Monday, May 4th at 9:00 a.m. in 1C for two appointees.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Are there any other announcements? Senator Jepsen.

SENATOR JEPSEN:

Thank you, Madam President. There will be a meeting of the Judiciary Committee on Friday morning five minutes before the House goes into session in the Hall of the House. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Senator Herbst.

SENATOR HERBST:

Thank you, Madam President. The Government Administration and Elections Committee will meet tomorrow 15 minutes before the session in the Hall of the House.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Are there any other announcements? Senator DiBella.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

ENVIRONMENT
PART 4
994-1346

1992

12
tcc

ENVIRONMENT

March 16, 1992

DEP. COMM. JOHN BLUM: Yes, I would certainly agree with that conclusion. I think the word "inspector", really comprehends, in our department, our field band our field men. They do allot more than inspecting. There the ones who communicate with the growers and the farmers. If there's a Pesticide Management Program that needs talking about.

Or Drug Treatment of Dairy Herd. And the same kind of function, with respect to growers, where they man the booth at state fairs, and do a lot of our development functions. So, subject to that, a narrow definition of inspection than the work they actually perform, I'd certainly go along with it.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you. Other questions?
Representative Mordasky.

REP. MORDASKY: Commissioner, I understand where Representative Lavine's coming from, because he's on the other end of this. But, it's bad enough having a milk inspector come around. But, if somebody comes from Consumer Protection, at least the milk inspectors know a little about agriculture. I don't know how much the Consumer Protection understands. And it would be demoralizing.

COMM. GLORIA SCHAFFER: You make a good point.

REP. MORDASKY: The bill didn't contemplate sending that to the farm. Good. (inaudible)

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you very much Commissioners.
Deputy Commissioner Filcheck to be followed by Jim Hadler.

JOHN FILCHER: Good afternoon. I'm John Filcher, Deputy Commissioner of Agriculture, and I will try to be very brief. I'm here to talk on Senate Bill, SB400, AN ACT CONCERNING RABIES CONTROL AND TECHNICAL REVISIONS TO PROVISIONS OF THE GENERAL STATUTES RELATING TO DOGS AND OTHER COMPANION ANIMALS.

The bill is predominately technical. Revision of the Canine Statutes. A majority of the proposed changes contained in the bill are designed to clarify language and to make the statutes easier to

March 16, 1992

understand. The Department of Agriculture supports these changes and we also offer several substantive changes as well.

And unless the committee would like, I can end there because we have submitted a written statement. And, if you'd like to talk about it in detail, we'd be more than happy to work with you. But, it's all there and language suggestions. So, unless you'd like me to get into detail, I'll conclude there.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Questions?

JOHN FILCHER: unless you want me to be brief.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you very much John.

JOHN FILCHER: Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Jim Hadler to be followed by Julia Wasserman.

DR. JAMES HADLER: Good afternoon. I am Dr. James Hadler, Chief of the Epidemiology Section of the State Department of Health Services, and here to testify in favor of Senate Bill, SB400, AN ACT CONCERNING RABIES CONTROL AND TECHNICAL REVISIONS TO PROVISIONS OF THE GENERAL STATUTES RELATING TO DOGS AND OTHER COMPANION ANIMALS.

So forth the same bill that you've just heard brief testimony on. State Health Departments has already submitted written testimony, but I felt it important to come in person to reinforce one aspect of the bill. And in case you had any questions about what's happening with the Rabies Epezuwadic and Epidemic in Connecticut.

Senate Bill SB400 has many minor amendments to current animal control statutes. The most important of these, from our perspective occur at the end of the bill, end of the 39 page bill, in Sections 31 and 32. Among other things, these authorized the Municipal Control Officer to investigate complaints of animal bites, and the quarantine the biting animal so that it could be observed for rabies.

While Animal Control Officers already have this power for dogs, they don't clearly have it for cats and other animals. This has emerged as a major practical rabies control problem in the past year. If you're bitten by a stray or wondering pet, you will find that you may have to both, capture the cat and shelter it to see if it develops rabies.

And whether you need the expensive rabies prevention treatment. This ends up being both frustrating to the bitten person and potentially dangerous. Most people don't have the facilities to observe a potentially rabid animal. And if indeed does develop rabies, it may further expose that person and others.

If it were a dog instead of a cat, this would not be a problem. The Town Animal Control Officer would end up overseeing and managing the situation. Although this may seem relatively trivial, it no longer is. Connecticut now has the second highest rate of animal rabies in the country. And already 5 cases of rabies and cats in the last couple of months have been diagnosed.

Three in strays, which expose people. Those of us on the front lines, are rapidly finding out the gaps in our current laws, and feel that this is certainly one of them. We expect to be in the forefront of the animals rabies epidemic in Connecticut, for at least the next decade. To make it easier to cope with and to minimize rabies exposure to people, it's going to be necessary to continue examining and potentially modifying gaps in our current authority.

So, thank you for your consideration of this bill. And, are there any questions?

SEN. SPELLMAN: Do you have any idea what this might carry because of a fiscal note?

DR. JAMES HADLER: In terms of a fiscal note, I'd have to defer to the Department of Agriculture on that, in terms of, in terms of how much additional work for Animal Control Officers this is going to take.

SEN. SPELLMAN: I should have asked John. John, are you still here? It doesn't matter, we'll find out later.

DR. JAMES HADLER: Yeah, I can say that since we handle, we along with the Department of Agriculture, do handle allot of the complaints of people who are bitten by stray cats, what to do. Because often they end up finding that there's a gap. They call all around town and no one wants to handle the animal. That this is something, may occur in any given town once a week, or possibly less.

So it's spread between the 169 towns, it's not necessarily a huge burden. But, for each person for whom it happens, it's a huge burden.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Questions from the committee?

REP. MUSHINSKY: Yeah I have a question. I know you didn't come prepared to talk on another bill. But maybe you could let us know in a few days. House Bill HB5753, is on the spaying and neutering on dogs and cats, and an establishment of a program for low cost spaying and neutering. Does the department think that would be helpful in terms of cutting down the stray population and reducing incidences of rabies?

DR. JAMES HADLER: That's a bill which we haven't thoroughly reviewed and I can't say I've given, you know, that I've given a detailed thought. But I think you've raised a valid question. If there is a way of keeping, especially some stray animals, from reproducing, than in a humane way, that's a consideration.

Because, we hear lots of complaints of people who are feeding rapidly multiplying numbers of animals outside their houses and than rabies comes into the area. And that's a major problem for the neighborhood as well as for that individual. And that's, and so the sort of control of especially the stray domestic animal population remains sort of an outstanding issue in terms of the rabies epidemic.

Those animals don't often get vaccinated, for example, and so that they are at risk for rabies. And the types of animals that children are apt to be playing with an around homes. It becomes a potential exposure problem.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you. Jack Tiffany, one second, one second. Representative Jack Tiffany.

REP. TIFFANY: I'm not sure if this should be addressed to you orwhatever but I was at a seminar (mike not on) Wednesday or Thursday of last week at UCONN. Dr. Zakerstein was down from Tufts, and was talking about inoculating domestic animals for rabies. And he made the statement that only licensed veterinarians could administer rabies vaccine.

And I was not aware that that was a law or part of the regs, because, he recommended that (inaudible) inoculate the animals because (inaudible) rabies vaccination. I never heard that you had have, be a licensed veterinarian to give rabbi shots. Do you any background to that?

DR. JAMES HADLER: Unfortunately again, I would defer to the Department of Agriculture, if there's somebody here who is aware of the laws on that.

SEN. SPELLMAN: We'll get a response to that.

DR. JAMES HADLER: Yeah, certainly from a practical point of view, it's conceivable that others could administer a vaccine, as you've already described. What the actual laws are in Connecticut, I'm not sure of.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you very much. Representative Wasserman to be followed by Representative Lee Samowitz.

REP. WASSERMAN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before you as in the role of Director of Health for the Town of Fairfield in northwestern, Connecticut. You have my written testimony, but I

HB 5629

The word "private" humane society and the word "any" humane society that is contained in the definition of the word "pound".

REP. MUSHINSKY: Harry, we'll take it out.

DR. HARRY SHOOK: Thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: This was a, this bill was a composite of some bills from other states. And, there's some language in here that really shouldn't have been in here. And one of the problems that cropped up immediately, I got phone calls immediately after the draft was available. Was the private, so.

DR. HARRY SHOOK: Okay

REP. MUSHINSKY: We'll fix it.

DR. HARRY SHOOK: One other word I would like to have modified, or added to. One Line 115, the word "permanently" unfit for surgery, I think you should either delete the word "permanently" or add "temporarily" or "permanently" unfit for surgery.

Because an animal could be presented today for surgery, and have a respiratory problem which in, maybe a week or 10 days, maybe cured. I have a couple of comments on Senate Bill SB400, concerning the rabies control and technical revisions. We wonder why, starting on Line 56, we continue to use the language canine control officer.

When, in last, in the 1991 session, we changed to animal control. And we think there ought to be some continuity or consistency. On Line 61, a grooming facility is defined as a place where dogs are groomed. There are many places now that groom only cats. Which means a cat groomer would not have to buy a grooming license.

Line 71, defines a keeper as having a dog in his possession. We think that this should either be changed to animal or include the word cats. Other than those comments, we would support the bill, because we do have a very serious problem in this state as far as rabies is concerned. It is now as far east as Southington.

And we don't know how he got from the last known case in the west to Southington, which is 26 miles, that's a long walk even on 4 legs. I'd be glad to answer any questions you have.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER: Yes, thank you. (mike not on) Dr. Shook, under Section 3 where you mentioned about, where it's mentioned about the animal population in (inaudible) fund, that this fund may contain money required by law. How much money do you feel would be required to have in this fund to provide a necessary (inaudible)?

DR. HARRY SHOOK: I don't feel qualified to answer that, because we had very little, or nothing to do with the drafting of the legislation. We have read it, and we do support the intent of it. So I really not qualified. Perhaps Dr. Logan, who is going to follow me, could tell you what they required in New Jersey to get it started.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Any further questions? If not, thank you Doctor. Dr. Mark Logan to be followed by Paul Hutchem.

(HB 5753)

DR. MARK LOGAN: Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of the committee, I am Dr. Mark Logan, I am a member of the New Jersey Veterinine Medical Association, and I sit on their Executive Board. Thank you for giving me the chance to come up to the State of Connecticut and speak to you today on behalf of the Connecticut Veterinary Medical Association.

I'd like to describe, if I may, the program that is in place in the State of New Jersey and give you some brief statistics about what has taken place over the last 7 years. And than answer any questions from the committee that may occur. The Spay Neuter Bill in the State of New Jersey was signed into law in 1983.

And, starting in 1984, the Program took effect. It was amended in the Years of 1986 and 1990 to include other animal populations in the bill. It is essentially a 2 part program. The first part is

All the welfare leagues that I mentioned are for the bill. Thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you, Irene. Betty McLaughlin from Audubon followed by Joyhn Lyman, III, Connecticut Apple Marketing Board.

BETTY MCLAUGHLIN: Good afternoon, members of the committee. My name is Betty McLaughlin. I am Director of Environment Affairs for the Connecticut Audubon Society, an environmental education and advocacy organization with 10,000 member families.

We would like the Environment Committee to seriously consider including the licensing of cats in SB400, a bill which seeks to control rabies and make other technical revisions to the General Statutes relating to dogs and other pets.

Obviously adopting a cat licensing program is not a technical revision, but we would like your consideration of such a program now due to the recent resurgence of rabies in Connecticut.

Responsible pet owners can and now by law must have their cats inoculated against rabies and a licensed program will help to enforce that mandate. further, something must be done to quell the growing unwanted cat population that fees around dumpsters during the day and then encroaches upon wildlife at night. For years Connecticut Audubon has been advocating cat licensing as a population control measure to maintain wildlife bio-diversity and to keep animals in the hands of responsible owners.

Now that Connecticut is in rabies epidemic, it's even more important, in fact, it's urgent that aggressive steps be taken to protect our human population and we urge you to include licensing cats in this legislation. Thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you, Betty. As you know, I support the idea, but realistically, that's a hell of a bill to attach with an amendment to this. So it may be a next year bill.

BETTY MCLAUGHLIN: Well, I felt like I had to come and say for the record that we think it's an important issue and it needs to be looked at and it looked like an opportunity to say it yet again, so here I am.

: Doing your job.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Okay, doing your job. Okay.

BETTY MCLAUGHLIN: Thanks for listening.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Okay, thank you, Betty. John Lyman, III and then Richard, I'm not sure what it says, but it looks like Lubers, Connecticut Apple Marketing Board.

JOHN LYMAN, III: Members of the Environment Committee, good afternoon. My name is John Lyman, III. I'm Vice President of Production for Lyman Orchards in Middlefield, which is a family farm that has been in operation since 1741.

I'm also Chairman of the Connecticut Apple Marketing Board which represents over 75 commercial apple growers by advertising and promoting Connecticut apples.

I'd like to express my objection to Raised HB5629 and specifically the section dealing with inspection of farm products. I think it would be a grave mistake to shift the responsibility of these inspections from the Commissioner of Agriculture to the Commissioner of Consumer Protection. I speak with some knowledge of this issue since this was a situation a few years ago.

During that time that Consumer Protection was supposed to be handling the inspections, the quality of farm products available to the Connecticut consumer was pitiful. We producers petitioned very hard to get inspections back into the Department of Agriculture as our profitability is directly related to the quality of the product we are selling.

LES MARTIN: Members of the committee, Ms. Mushinsky, my name is Les Martin from the PETS organization, which is Pet Education and Training Society of Connecticut. I have two communiques from the Board of Directors of that organization. They're brief. We are not opposed to either of these proposed legislations. We do have a feeling that we want to get into them considerably deeper than we've had time or have been able to do.

The first concerns HB5753. We are supportive of the concept of HB5753 which appears to intend to address pet overpopulation problems, however, we have several concerns. One of them is one I've heard put forth previously and that has to do with the question will the \$35 fee actually reduce the number of individuals who might obtain the cat or dog from a pound.

Another question which is it is legal to legislative a private pound or humane society and I think we got kind of a --.

REP. MUSHINSKY: We're going to take that out. That's a drafting mistake.

LES MARTIN: Yes, okay.

REP. MUSHINSKY: My drafting error.

LES MARTIN: Yes, I thought I heard the answer to that earlier. Will these funds actually be solely dedicated for the stated purpose? We would like to see the term "Canine Control Officer" be changed to "Animal" so that it's consistent. It seems to bounce back and forth.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Well, we keep fixing those as they come in. They keep coming in with the old name and we send them out with the new name. So we always fix that.

LES MARTIN: Okay. As I mentioned, we would like to comment further on this and we will be in touch with the committee.

March 16, 1992

The other is in response to SB400. We have many concerns regarding SB400, and as I said earlier, we are not necessarily opposed to it. We do feel that we'd like to do a lot more work on it. The actual statement says a major component of this bill concerns technical revisions in the regulations of pet shops, kennels, grooming and training facilities, including the redefinition of same.

The mechanism for addressing this entire issue is the Pet Shop Advisory Committee in the Department of Agriculture. Due to the length and complexity of this 39 page bill, which was released only ten days ago, we are still in the process of compiling appropriate substitute language. We will submit our written suggestions and concerns to all of you as soon as possible.

Again, we strongly recommend that this bill go to the Pet Shop Advisory Committee. Thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you. We will have to act on that pretty quickly because it is a short session. In fact, we were going to screen it tomorrow.

LES MARTIN: Yes.

REP. MUSHINSKY: At 1:00. So if you have any major pieces that you want to comment on, you might want to give us those before 1:00 tomorrow to the Environment Committee. You can just call them in, by phone would be fine.

LES MARTIN: Okay, great. Thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you. And finally, John Hibbard. No John. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify? If not, the hearing is adjourned.



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

Statement of Testimony
SB 400
March 16, 1992

AN ACT CONCERNING RABIES CONTROL AND TECHNICAL REVISIONS TO PROVISIONS
OF THE GENERAL STATUTES RELATING TO DOGS AND OTHER COMPANION ANIMALS

Testimony of Susan S. Addiss, MPH, MURs, Commissioner, Department of Health Services.

The Department of Health Services (DHS) supports Raised Bill No. 400 and has conferred with the Department of Agriculture on the need for the statutory revisions relating to rabies control which are contained in the Bill. The proposed legislation will facilitate the containment of the current rabies epidemic in Connecticut by expanding the authority and responsibility of local animal control officers to manage domestic animals other than dogs, in particular, cats.

The DHS has received numerous complaints from local health directors that some local animal control officers have refused to handle cats, especially stray cats suspected of being rabid, because the officers are not mandated by statute to do so. These refusals put the public at risk and inappropriately require local health officers and citizens to be responsible for arranging the capture and quarantine of animals that bite a human or domestic animal.

The threat to humans from raccoon rabies is both from direct contact with raccoons and from exposure to cats and dogs that develop rabies after raccoon exposure. Cats have been a major source of human exposure in other affected states because cats are often unvaccinated and become aggressive when rabid.

The need for the proposed legislation is particularly important now that Connecticut has become one of the leading states nationally in the total number of raccoon rabies cases with its attendant threat to domestic animals and humans. Raccoon rabies has been spreading up the coast from Virginia since the late 1970s and reached western Connecticut in March of 1991. Since that time, 319 animal rabies cases have been reported in the state, including five cats and one dog. These are the first cases of rabies involving domestic animals in Connecticut in 50 years. Cases of animal rabies have now been reported from all towns in Fairfield County, four towns in Litchfield County, and one town in Hartford County. The rabies epizootic (widespread illness among animals) is expected to spread across Connecticut over the next two years.

Rabies is a viral infection that attacks the central nervous system. The rabies virus is transmitted in the saliva of a rabid animal, usually through bites. There is also a risk of infection if saliva or brain tissue from a rabid animal enters an open wound or contacts mucous membranes in the mouth, nose or eyes. If preventive treatment is not given following exposure, there is up to a 50% risk that an exposed person will develop rabies. Rabies in humans usually develops 1-2 months after exposure and nearly always progresses over the course of several weeks to death.

It is of vital public health importance that the Committee act favorably on Bill No. 400.

3385P

Phone:
150 Washington Street — Hartford, Connecticut 06106
An Equal Opportunity Employer



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



Public Hearing --- March 16, 1992
Committee on the Environment

Testimony Submitted by Commissioner Timothy R. E. Keeney
Department of Environmental Protection

Raised Bill No. 400 - An Act Concerning Rabies Control and
Technical Revisions to Provisions of
the General Statutes Relating to Dogs
and Other Companion Animals.

The Department of Environmental Protection is in full support of this bill; in particular, the effort to clarify the authority of Animal Control and Public Safety Officers to destroy wild animals presenting a risk to public health and safety.

An important rabies control measure involves the dispatching of high risk wild animals displaying signs or symptoms suggestive of rabies. Any wild carnivorous animal, particularly a raccoon, skunk or fox, with signs of abnormal behavior or neurological distress should be destroyed in order to protect people, domestic animals and other wildlife from the risk of rabies exposure. Current protocol also requires that any wild animal involved in exposure to people or pets be destroyed and submitted for rabies testing.

With the presence and spread of rabies in our state, a sick wild animal in a situation likely to expose the public can no longer be considered as having a disease other than rabies, and official response has become more critical. Regardless of staffing levels of the Department, it will never be possible to expect that our state Conservation Officers can accomplish this task alone or in a timely manner. Response to sick animal complaints by local authorities should be facilitated and encouraged.

Phone:

165 Capitol Avenue • Hartford, Connecticut 06106

An Equal Opportunity Employer

001143

Connecticut Audubon Society

Environmental Center
118 Oak Street Hartford, Connecticut 06106 Telephone (203) 527-8737

TESTIMONY before Connecticut General Assembly's
Environment Committee

On: Including Licensing of Cats in SB 400

BY: Elizabeth McLaughlin, Director of Environmental
Affairs, Connecticut Audubon Society

DATE: March 16, 1992

Connecticut Audubon would like the Environment Committee to seriously consider including the licensing of cats in this bill which seeks to control rabies and make other technical revisions to general statutes relating to dogs and other pets.

Obviously, adopting a cat licensing program is not a technical revision, but we would like your consideration of such a program now due to the recent resurgence of rabies in Connecticut.

Responsible pet owners can and by law must have their pets inoculated against rabies, but something must be done to quell the growing unwanted cat population that feeds around dumpsters during the day then encroaches upon wildlife at night. For years Connecticut Audubon has been advocating cat licensing as a population control measure to maintain wildlife biodiversity and to keep animals in the hands of responsible owners. Now that Connecticut is in rabies epidemic, it's even more important, in fact it is urgent, that aggressive steps be taken to protect our human population. We urge you to include licensing cats in this legislation.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

STATEMENT OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
REGARDING
SENATE BILL 400
AN ACT CONCERNING RABIES CONTROL
AND TECHNICAL REVISIONS TO PROVISIONS
OF THE GENERAL STATUTES RELATING
TO DOGS AND OTHER COMPANION ANIMALS

MARCH 16, 1992

This bill is predominantly a technical revision of the Canine statutes. The majority of the proposed changes contained in the bill are designed to clarify language and to make the statutes easier to understand and to work with.

The Department of Agriculture accepts and supports the proposed technical changes, but does want to suggest some technical corrections as well as substantive changes which have been included in the bill at the department's request.

Let me inform you of the substantive changes we are proposing.

First, we suggest that the exemption from having a Training License if a business already has a Commercial Kennel or Grooming License be abolished. We believe that this exemption makes enforcement of the Training Facility regulations more difficult. The various licenses issued by the department are for specific purposes and this exemption is not needed. This matter is dealt with in the definitions section of the bill.

The second subject area relates to a clarification of what monies should be included by municipalities for payment to the dog fund. In section 25 of the bill we suggest that **INCLUDING PENALTIES** be added to make it clear that these funds should also be part of the payment calculations.

The intent of the department was for penalties to be included, but the language is somewhat vague. At present many municipalities include penalties in their calculations while other do not.

The third substantive area deals with the control of rabies. The language in the bill includes what the department deems as necessary for the control of this disease. We do have some technical suggestions as noted in our proposed amendment. (attached)

Section 31 expands the ability of people to defend themselves if attacked by animals other than dogs. It further provides for the quarantine of animals, capable of carrying and transmitting the disease rabies, which attack or bite humans. This change is necessary, for while existing law regarding the quarantine for dogs is adequate, statutory authority to quarantine other types of animals for rabies is lacking.

Section 32 of the bill expands the definition of exposure to, or contact with a suspected, or confirmed, rabid animal. It provides a criteria for the quarantine of such animals. It establishes a method whereby an animal held in quarantine and clinically diagnosed as having the disease rabies, may be humanely euthanized without notice to the owner or keeper. It also allows for the sale or disposal of unclaimed animals. Lastly, the bill provides authority for public officials to destroy wild animals which are believed to be rabid.

The following are proposed amendments to S.B. 400 AAC Rabies Control and Technical Revisions to Provisions of the General Statutes Relating to Dogs and other Companion Animals.

In line 64 delete, OR GROOMING

In line 66 delete, OR GROOMS

Starting in line 68 after PLACE delete, the comma and OTHER THAN A COMMERCIAL KENNEL,

In line 69 after DOGS insert, AND CATS

In line 72 after DOG and before the semi-colon insert, a comma and CAT OR OTHER ANIMAL

Starting in line 89 after PLACE delete, the comma and OTHER THAN A COMMERCIAL KENNEL OR GROOMING FACILITY,

In line 131 delete, the opening bracket

In line 218 after dog insert, AND ANIMALS

In line 724 after upon insert, a closing bracket and UPON RECEIPT OF A

In line 725 after the comma insert, THE COMMISSIONER.

In line 726 delete, upon each

In line 726 after and, insert, IN THE CASE OF AN

In line 729 delete, wherein

In line 729 after municipality insert, IN WHICH

In line 729 delete, shall

In line 729 after shop insert, IS TO

In line 730 after maintained, insert, SHALL

In line 731 delete the period and the closing bracket

In line 731 after thirty-first insert, a comma and IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SECTION.

In line 758 delete, TWENTY-FIRST and insert, THIRTY-FIRST

In line 766 after upon insert a closing bracket and after the bracket insert, UPON RECEIPT OF A

In line 767 after the comma insert, THE COMMISSIONER

- In line 771 delete, wherein
- In line 771 after municipality insert, IN WHICH
- In line 771 delete, shall
- In line 771 after facility insert, IS TO
- In line 773 delete the closing bracket after thirty-first.
- In line 773 delete, upon the terms required for the original license
- In line 773 after ANNUALLY insert a comma and NOT LATER THAN
DECEMBER THIRTY-FIRST, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THIS
SECTION
- In line 787 after such insert, COMMERCIAL
- In line 810 after such insert, COMMERCIAL
- In line 811 after such insert, COMMERCIAL
- In line 813 after such insert, COMMERCIAL
- In line 921 after fees insert, INCLUDING PENALTIES
- In line 1174 after owner insert, OR KEEPER
- In line 1254 after dog delete, or any
- In line 1254 after dog insert, a comma and CAT OR OTHER
- In line 1312 delete, and
- In line 1312 after COMMISSIONER insert a comma
- In line 1312 after OFFICER insert OR ANY STATE OR MUNICIPAL POLICE
OFFICER
- Beginning in line 1316 delete, ANIMAL OTHER THAN A DOG, CAT OR ANY
ANIMAL USED IN AGRICULTURE.
- In line 1316 after ANY insert, MAMMAL WHICH IS FERAE NATURAE OR WILD
BY NATURE.