

PA13-103

HB6311

House	2719-2728	10
Planning & Development	555-567, 571-572, 576- 578, 630-631, 633-637, 666-679	39
Senate	3957-3970	14
		63

H - 1157

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL.56
PART 8
2370 - 2742**

tally.

THE CLERK:

Bill 6340 as amended by House "A."	
Total number voting	141
Necessary for adoption	71
Those voting Yea	141
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	9

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The bill as amended passes.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 358.

THE CLERK:

On page 21 of today's calendar, House Calendar 358, favorable report of the Joint Senate Committee on Planning and Development, House Bill 6311, AN ACT PROHIBITING MUNICIPALITIES FROM ADOPTING BREED-SPECIFIC JOB ORDINANCES.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Rojas, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ROJAS (9th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will you remark, sir?

REP. ROJAS (9th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The bill bars municipalities from adopting breed-specific dog legislation. Often when there is an incident in which a dog bites a person or attacks a person sometimes the reactions by a municipality is to attempt to ban certain breeds of dogs from being owned in a municipality. Obviously, this interrupts with the rights of a person to own a dog that they like, but also it has the unintended consequence in certain dogs being large amounts in our animal shelters and they're not allowed to be adopted which results in increased costs for the municipalities.

I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir.

The ranking member, Representative Aman of the 14th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Good evening, Madam Speaker.

I have a couple of questions for the proponent of

the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Please proceed.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Yes. It's my understanding that currently in the state of Connecticut there are no municipalities that have a breed-specific dog ordinance on the books, but that in other areas of the country several communities have barred certain breeds of dogs. Through you, Madam Speaker, is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Rojas.

REP. ROJAS (9th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, that's correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Yes. And I believe some of the communities that have banned dogs have usually banned pit bulls or a variety similar to that and it's almost my understanding that it's been a very difficult ordinance for towns around the country that have tried to regulate these to enforce. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Rojas.

REP. ROJAS (9th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, that's correct. One example is Prince George County in Maryland attempted to ban pit bulls in their county. It resulted in about a \$250,000 a year cost and actually didn't result in a decrease in dog bites by that particular dog. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Yes. And that's also my understand that barring some sort of DNA test on an animal or some very specific way of trying to define, people may know and look at a dog and say that's the type of dog I want to ban, but actually trying to come up with a definition or a determination is very difficult. It was very clear in the testimony that we received from a whole variety of people that problems with vicious dogs is not the breed of dog, but on the training or lack of training the dogs had. It's also very clear that this regulation does not change the community's ability to regulate roaming dogs, vicious dogs, dogs that have

bitten, et cetera, that those regulations are still enforced. So I do think that this regulation has been supported by numerous people and it is something this chamber should also support. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir.

Would you care to remark further on the bill that's before us?

Representative Diane Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would just like to thank the chairs of the Planning and Development Committee, as well as the ranking members, for bringing this bill forward. The testimony in the public hearing was overwhelmingly positive and I think that it shows our concern for families and their pets and being sure that we do not take a pet away from a family for reason that is totally without base. So I thank everybody for all their work they did on this. And I urge my colleagues to support the bill. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, madam.

Would you care to remark?

Representative Miner, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I just want to rise in support of the bill as well. I think all too often dogs of one breed or another as misunderstood, English Bulldogs, Border Collies, you name it, one man's pet is another man's villain, I guess, so if this stops us from banning something needlessly, I think it's a good idea. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir.

Will you care to remark further? Will you care to remark?

Representative Kupchick of the 132nd, you have the floor, madam.

REP. KUPCHICK (132nd):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I, too, rise in support this legislation. I would like to thank the ranking members and the chairman of the committee. This is an important piece of legislation. My son lives in Florida and in Miami, they have this legislation in place where they banned

specific breeds. And literally within a month after they passed that legislation, these certain breed dogs were found roaming all over the city. People were forced to give up their animals because they were in violation of a law and -- for no good reason and it an extremely discriminatory practice and I'm glad that Connecticut is standing up and saying that we are not going to stand for such discrimination.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, madam.

Would you care to remark?

Representative Pam Sawyer of the 55th, good evening, ma'am.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Good evening, Madam Speaker.

A question, through you, to the proponent of the legislation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Please proceed.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

In looking at the bill, line 8, where it talks about other types of animals, would you just for legislation intent discuss how a wolf dog would fall

under this? One of the situations we've found in other parts of the country has been the aggressive nature of animals that are half dog, half wolf and there are some places don't allow them because their severe aggression. They can't be trusted. That type of thing. Just for legislative intent, does this allow a municipality to exclude wolves? We'll just go with a straight wolf. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Rojas.

REP. ROJAS (9th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, the bill is silent on whether a municipality could ban a wolf. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

So in this case, a municipality could not ban a wolf dog. Is that the case? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Rojas.

REP. ROJAS (9th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, is the dog is defined -- a wolf dog is defined as a dog and there have been

attempts in other parts of the country to ban wolf dogs, I would say that yes -- a municipality would not be able to ban their ownership. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In the case of the wolf, I think that those are consider wild animals and they're not allowed to be held and then in the case of a wolf dog, I have concerns about that, but I appreciate the legislative intent. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, Madam.

Will you care to remark further on the bill before us? Will you care to remark further on the bill before us? Will you care to remark further?

If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your seats, the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Will members please return to the chamber immediately.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?
Please check the board to determine if your vote has
been properly cast. If all members have voted, the
machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a
tally, please.

And would the Clerk please announce the
tally.

THE CLERK:

Bill 6311.

Total number voting	142
Necessary for adoption	72
Those voting Yea	142
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	8

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The bill passes.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 463.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Madam Speaker, on page 33, House Calendar
463, favorable report of the Joint Committee on
Judiciary, Substitute House Bill 6641, AN ACT
CONCERNING THE SEXUAL ASSAULT OF A PERSON WHO IS
PHYSICALLY HELPLESS OR WHOSE ABILITY TO CONSENT IS

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PLANNING AND
DEVELOPMENT
PART 2
337 - 680**

2013

COMMITTEE

anything like that, it is the technical part. And the access -- access for both environmental groups or builders, a fair access system and that's what we're trying to do. So this bill will come back.

If you're speaking today, don't be concerned about the wording of the bill. You could be more helpful by talking about what you think could be better in the bill, and that's what we're trying to do. So again the bill is there very simply because we -- by law we have to by certain dates have bills forward when they can't go forward, so we have put that on knowing that it will be dramatically changed.

Several of us, 10:00 Transportation is meeting somewhere, and so I'm Transportation, so you'll see some of us going back and forth. We've actually been missing a couple of meetings because we've been going so intense with some of these that we got to kind of watch the clock. So I apologize if you see members get up and leave and come back. But again that's part of the process of having so much done in a short period of time.

So for members who have multiple meetings at this time, I think three or four are going on, feel free to go to those meetings, come back. As far as the committee meeting, that is open until 2:00 on the early meeting.

The first person on the agenda, Brenda Kupchick, Representative from Fairfield. Brenda, are you here? Oh, great. Welcome.

Followed by MaryAnn Handley and Representative Kim Rose.

REP. KUPCHICK: Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify on this bill. I'm a co-

HB6311

February 20, 2013

jmf/gbr PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

10:00 A.M.

COMMITTEE

introducer with group of bipartisan Legislators who are supporting bills that are pro-animal or animal welfare bills. And I'll just read:

Dear Senator Cassano, Senator Fasano, Rep. Rojas, and Rep. Aman and members of the Planning Committee:

I come before you today in strong support of 6311, AN ACT PROHIBITING MUNICIPALITIES FROM ADOPTING BREED SPECIFIC LANGUAGE ON DANGEROUS DOG ORDINANCES. For the past 20 years I have worked with rescues, have fostered dogs, and volunteered with various animal shelters. And in my experience, breed specific language would be very harmful to breeds in attempts to control, unfairly targets specific breeds, and has limited statistical data to back up its claim.

Pit bills are one of the breeds targeted by this legislation. However, Pit Bulls are scientifically less vicious dogs than other breeds. In a recent study of 122 dog breeds by the American Temperament Testing Society, Pit Bulls achieved a passing rate of 83.9 percent, better than Beagles at 78.2, and Golden Retrievers at 83.2 percent.

In addition, many owners of targeted breeds feel that breed specific language violates the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and its due process clause as well as the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act. Furthermore, there are many alternatives to breed specific language such as safety education, spay and neuter assistance, breeder regulation, low-cost training, and stiffer penalties for those who abuse animals.

Some examples, in 2001, a Baltimore -- in

COMMITTEE

Baltimore, Maryland, auditor estimated that it would cost \$750,000 to enforce a breed specific plan. In 2008, Omaha proposed breed specific language that would cost over half a million dollars to enforce.

The United Kingdom's Dangerous Dog Act, which includes a ban on certain breeds of dogs, is estimated to have cost over 14 million to enforce between the years of '91 and '96, no more recent numbers are available. And it has come under fire lately as dog bites committed by nontargeted dogs rise despite the ban.

Breed specific language is a costly idea that does not serve a pragmatic purpose. It punishes responsible dogs and their owners by unfairly targeting certain breeds and essentially casts a death sentence on those dogs it targets.

I hope you will take some time to review this. And just personally I would like to say that my son and his fiancée have three Pit Bulls that they've rescued and had a very difficult time finding a place that would rent to them because of these dogs. These dogs are not aggressive, they are very docile animals. And literally was going to become an issue where they couldn't find a place to live because of the dogs. And people just have this fear of certain animals, and it really isn't the animal, but really the person who was with the animal and how they treat the animal.

So I would hope that you would take this into consideration. I would also like to note that the Humane Society is in support of this bill and they have submitted testimony. Thank you very much.

SENATOR CASSANO: Let me just say that we have ten

COMMITTEE

hearing items, the majority of letters are letters in support of this bill.

We learned as kids that you can't judge a book by its cover, and I think that's the -- the real key here. And between phone calls and letters it's been actually very impressive from around the state the number of dog owners and those adopting dogs and those that have dogs to adopt who have come forward with information. And so I do appreciate you coming forward on this and clearly intend to support it, and I think there's going to be a lot of support for the bill because it makes sense.

Any questions of the Representative?

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN: Yes, Brenda, thank you for bringing that forward. As we -- as we work on the current legislation that you're proposing, have any Connecticut municipalities already passed breed specific regulations? I know a lot are talking about it, but I didn't know if any had actually put it into ordinance form.

REP. KUPCHICK: You know, I'm not aware of it. I know there are certain -- I think there's a lot of it written into certain landlord agreements so that you can't have a certain kind of dog, they'll allow dogs but not Pit Bulls or not German Shepherds or Rottweilers. Although I'm not -- I'm not certain about any towns, I think there has been some discussion about it in some communities. And that was the reason why we wanted to put the legislation in.

REP. AMAN: Okay. In the discussion that you've had about defining breeds, how are the ordinances that have been drawn define a breed? Or if somebody doesn't register their dog as a pure

COMMITTEE

bred, how does a municipality even begin saying whether it is a pure bred Pit Bull or Rottweiler or German Shepherd or a Beagle?

REP. KUPCHICK: It's tricky because in the case of Pit Bulls, they can be classified under three separate categories, American Stafford, Terrier, American Bulldog Terrier, there's different designations. You're right.

REP. AMAN: But if someone doesn't register it with a breed association, how do you say that that is that breed?

REP. KUPCHICK: You know, I'm not sure how they do it. I know that Miami passed a ban on Pit Bulls in general. They used the word Pit Bull. And what happened was they gave -- and they didn't even grandfather the dogs that people had, so people literally had to get their dogs, I mean again they wouldn't be able to bring them outside, walk them, because for fear of being identified as breaking that ordinance and that law.

People were literally dumping their dogs in the street, going over into neighboring communities, over to Fort Lauderdale and dumping their dogs there. It caused a real problem in Miami. And I know that Broward County was also looking at something like that. So I'm not sure how -- how they identify it. But again they were targeting specific breeds.

REP. AMAN: I know a few years ago we also talked and I don't think anything happened with the legislation regarding insurance companies that basically said if you had these -- these breeds of dogs, they either upped your premium or they just absolutely refused to sell you insurance. From the various groups that you've been working with, is that still going on or has

COMMITTEE

that settled down to a more reasonable level?

REP. KUPCHICK: You know, I think it is still going on. I know that when I recently changed insurance companies, they asked me what kind of dog I had or what kind of dogs I had. I know a friend who couldn't get insurance because she had two Pit Bulls. They had to search around quite -- quite a bit to find insurance to cover her house. And she never even let the dogs out, she had a fenced yard and such like that.

But I think it is still an issue. I don't think it's just as prevalent or in the news, but I think it is still an issue. I'd be curious to know what your Committee did with it, did your Committee --

REP. AMAN: No, it was -- this was several years ago and I'm not sure which, you know, it was one of the public hearings that -- I don't think it went anywhere only because no -- the same problem I just talked about, breed, how do you define breeds? Now you're trying to tell an insurance company what you can and cannot do. And I think -- I don't think the legislation went forward, but it could have.

REP. KUPCHICK: It's happening, though. I mean just six months ago I did have a friend who had difficulty changing her insurance to get a better rate because of the breed of dog that she has.

REP. AMAN: Thank you very much for coming forward, Representative.

REP. KUPCHICK: Thank you.

REP. ROJAS: Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and

COMMITTEE

Representative Kupchick. Thanks for coming and testifying. I just have one quick question. So you talked about these leases, right? So all we're saying is a municipality can't adopt an ordinance?

REP. KUPCHICK: Right.

REP. RITTER: But that would have obviously no ability to restrict anyone from having individual provisions with their tenant and landlord relationships?

REP. KUPCHICK: Absolutely. I was just mentioning as an issue --

REP. RITTER: Got you.

REP. KUPCHICK: -- that I think that if a community does ban a specific breed, it just gives more weight --

REP. RITTER: Sure.

REP. KUPCHICK: -- to landlords to be able to deny access to people.

REP. RITTER: And as you can imagine, through you, Mr. Chairman, in Hartford actually in our animal shelter, the most common is not straight Pit Bull, it's actually a mixture, it's often a breed. And it's been a real problem in our pound. I know that a lot of dogs unfortunately are put down. And every month, you know, you'll see a plea and things like that. And a lot of people have adopted them, but -- but not enough. So I think I'd be supportive of this, so thank you.

REP. KUPCHICK: And I would just mention that people think that they're just in inner-cities in the shelters. I mean in my suburban town the

COMMITTEE

majority of the dogs in the shelter are Pit Bulls.

REP. ROJAS: Are there any other questions?

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, Representative.

REP. KUPCHICK: Good morning.

REP. SMITH: Yeah. I was looking at the language and I realize just the, you know, very limited language we have here, but it talks about amending the general statutes to prohibit the breeding or -- to prohibit the discrimination of people against certain breeds. But there's no current statute on file, right, that deals with this issue?

REP. KUPCHICK: Not that I'm aware of. You mean state statute?

REP. SMITH: Yes.

REP. KUPCHICK: No, not that I'm aware of.

REP. SMITH: Okay. And also there's no, as far as you can tell, there's no municipalities right now that prohibit any type of discrimination against breeds?

REP. KUPCHICK: I don't know that there is. I know there's been talk about it in some communities in the state.

REP. SMITH: You know, it's interesting, Pit Bulls have this connotation with them as being dangerous and violent and vicious, and I've been a dog owner all my life, mostly Brittany Springers. - My dog wanted a Pit Bull. I said

COMMITTEE

listen you can get a Pit Bull when you graduate college, you have your own place, good luck to you. So guess what happened? He got a Pit Bull. And lo and behold, you know, he was in a car accident and so he had -- we had to have the Pit Bull at our house, which I was a little leery about.

That dog is the sweetest, friendliest dog I have ever had, and I've had dogs all my life. And I was just so shocked because you hear of all the stories of how, you know, how horrendous these dogs could be. I could not have been pleased, in fact, when he took her back recently I'm like you can't take this dog back, what are you doing?

So it's -- I think it's really an education process and I was certainly educated, I think we all need to be educated that, you know, certain dogs, you know, if you mistreat her, mis-train, or abuse dogs, you know, you're going to have a problem. But if you treat them with love just like anybody else, you know, you'll be fine. So thank you for coming today and sharing this bill.

REP. KUPCHICK: Well, thank you for sharing that. I have a similar story. I -- I've fostered a lot of animals over the years in my house, sick animals, but I never had a Pit Bull in my house. And when I went to visit my son in Florida and I had never met these three dogs. And I have to admit, I was a little apprehensive. Three Pit Bulls, that's a little frightening. And he said they're great dogs, Mom, don't worry. And I'm thinking three Pit Bulls.

And I came into the house, I was very cautious with them, and within two hours I couldn't believe how relaxed they were, how nice they

COMMITTEE

were, and with each other, even when there was a toy or food, nothing, no aggression at all. And I'll tell you, I have two Beagles and if you put a, you know, a steak bone in the middle of the room, there's going to be dog fight. So it's an interesting -- you're right. There's a -- there's a real perception, a bad perception of them, and it's unfortunate, really.

REP. ROJAS: Representative Diminico.

REP. DIMINICO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Is there any data out there or any studies that support that certain specific breeds are more dangerous than others?

REP. KUPCHICK: Well, I talked about these -- it's a temperament study, I allude to it in my testimony. And it's called the American Temperament Testing Society, and they give rates to different breeds. And like I said in the testimony, Pit Bulls achieved an 83.9 percent and they were better than Beagles, believe it or not, which people -- which I actually have -- but are usually considered a very good family dog.

And they do a temperament study. I think what the problem is is that I think if you take any dog and are abusive to it or teach it to be mean, it's going to be mean regardless of what kind of dog it is. And it's more about who has the dog than what dog it is.

REP. DIMINICO: But no municipalities keep data on dog attacks or dog bites or any of that kind of stuff and what kind of breeds they are in the state?

REP. KUPCHICK: Oh, I don't know if they do. I don't know, I mean I think that probably the police logs probably keep if there are, you

COMMITTEE

know, dog bites or dog attacks.

REP. DIMINICO: I find that the old expression a dog is a reflection of their master, I kind of agree to that.

On the campaign trail this year, I met a lot of dogs and I kind of found the -- the first thing they do is they come up and they smell all the other dogs that you saw during the day. But I found that the Pit Bull to be quite tranquil and timid. And I'm a firm believer that it's the way the dog is treated is really what it's all about.

Thank you.

REP. KUPCHICK: It's true. It's listed as being, if you want a guard dog not to get a Pit Bull because they -- they're more afraid of anybody coming into your house. You're better off with a different breed.

REP. ROJAS: Representative Sear.

REP. SEAR: Thank you, Chairman. My first question was what precipitated this bill and is it basically rumblings or whatever that you heard out there that there were municipalities that were considering this sort of action?

REP. KUPCHICK: Well, there were a group of us bipartisan Legislators that formed an animal rights welfare caucus. And I know we each came to the group with various different bills that we were interested in. Diana Urban had an interest in this bill. She had heard there were some communities discussing it. I believe New Haven had a couple of Pit Bull situations.

There was a -- and I think we saw it in the news I think it was last year, a year ago,

COMMITTEE

where a woman and two grandchildren were killed by her two own Pit Bulls. And there was a lot of discussion about banning Pit Bulls in communities then. And I think that might have been the reason why this legislation was put forward.

REP. SEAR: So you're taking a proactive approach to this in terms of what's going on. I'm very much in support of it. It's very interesting that this is not just a legislative kind of process, but it's raising this whole question and everybody is talking about it and the breeds and such.

In reference to you on the campaign trail, I got bit once and it was a Chihuahua. So for about two hours, I was all about ordinances banning Chihuahuas. I got over that, but the Pit Bulls were okay, but, true story.

But it's interesting because this does raise the general discussion just about Pit Bulls. And I know in our -- when we adopted a regional animal control facility for our town to go from local to the regional, when our previous animal control officer left, there was one dog that was in this transition process, it was a Pit bull.

And not being a dog owner, I was terrified when I heard that -- that term, you know, and I had to go to the old dog pound to kind of assist them to move it, or whatever, and I got an education at that time for me -- the new animal control officer that it's not the breed, that they can be wonderful dogs. It's how they're treated and everything. So I applaud you.

Thank you.

REP. KUPCHICK: Thank you.

REP. ROJAS: Representative Simanski.

REP. SIMANSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Brenda, for coming to talk to us. I work for an insurance company handling claims, and I've handled many, many a dog bite claim during my career. And it is not restricted to any one specific breed or any different breeds that are vicious as has been said here, it's the way the dogs are brought up. In fact the worst dog bite case I ever handled was done by a Golden Retriever.

Conversely, my sister adopted a Pit Bull from the pound. It was two years old and it is the most sweet and loving and gentle animal. They'll just play with you all day long. So it has nothing to do with the breed, as you've heard many people say, it's the way the dog is brought up. So thank you for your testimony.

REP. KUPCHICK: Thank you. That's interesting.

REP. ROJAS: Are there any other questions?

No?

Thank you for your testimony, Representative.

REP. KUPCHICK: Thank you very much.

REP. ROJAS: Mary Ann Handley followed by Representative Kim Rose and Representative Tim Ackert.

Good morning, Senators, nice to see you back.

A VOICE: Welcome back.

MARY ANN HANDLEY: You have to press it. There we go. Okay.

SB817

COMMITTEE

just can't afford to keep them up. And I think this will certainly be a step in the right direction to help to preserve that scenic view. So I thank you for bringing to our attention and once again it's great to see you.

MARY ANN HANDLEY: Nice to see you, Senator.

REP. ROJAS: Are there any other questions from members of the Committee?

No?

Seeing none, thank you for your testimony.

MARY ANN HANDLEY: Thank you.

REP. ROJAS: Kim Rose, Representative Kim Rose, followed by Representative Tim Ackert followed by Representative Diana Urban.

REP. ROSE: Good morning, Chairman Cassano and Chairman Rojas. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

I, too, am here to support House Bill 6311, the ACT PROHIBITING MUNICIPALITIES FROM ADOPTING BREED SPECIFIC DANGEROUS DOG ORDINANCES. One of my constituents, Lisa Taylor-Austin, has submitted testimony. She was unable to be here today. So what I've done is I've taken part of her testimony that I'm going to read to you and when considering this bill if you have any questions, hers is quite extensive. She happens to be pretty much of an expert on this.

I'm testifying before you today in support of this act on behalf of Lisa Taylor-Austin who was unable to be present today. BSL has proven not to work. It's an emotional reaction to a human, not canine, situation. Unfortunately, Pit bulls are the most abused and euthanized

COMMITTEE

dog in America today. We have placed prejudicial notions onto Pit Bulls when, in fact, the responsibility should be placed on irresponsible owners. Over and over again Pit Bulls are abused, tortured, murdered due to the actions of humans and it has to stop.

Furthermore, BSL is costly and does not reduce dog bites. The United Kingdom's Dangerous Dog Act bans the American Pit Bull Terrier and three other breeds of dogs and their crossbreeds. Yet reports from the U.K. indicate that dog bites requiring hospital treatment have not decreased. Rather 4,328 dog bites were reported and treated in the U.K. hospitals in 1999, whereas in the year ending April 2011, there were 6100 such treatments, an increase of 41 percent over ten years. The U.K. also continues to experience approximately four dog bite fatalities per year.

Some possible alternatives to BSL are containment laws, abuse prevention, safety education, spay and neuter assistance, breeder regulation, low-cost training, and stiffer penalties for dog fighters or those who attend dog fights and they abuse animals. BSL is unnecessary and only punishes responsible dog owners. On behalf of Lisa Taylor-Austin and myself, I urge you to join us in fully supported H.B. 6311.

And thank you for your consideration.

REP. ROJAS: Thank you for your testimony.

Are there any questions for Representative Rose?

Seeing none, thank you.

REP. ROSE: Thank you.

REP. ROJAS: Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Senator Cassano, and Rep. Rojas. I don't have my written testimony in front of you, but you will be getting it. For the record I am Diana Urban, Representative from the 43rd District, and I'm here to testify on House Bill 6311, which is AN ACT PROHIBITING MUNICIPALITIES FROM ADOPTING BREED SPECIFIC DANGEROUS DOG ORDINANCES. And I think that you have heard quite a bit of information on it already, so I will simply add to some of the questions that were asked.

And the questions that were asked is has this been a problem in Connecticut already? And the answer to that is there have been several municipalities that have flirted with doing breed specific dangerous dog ordinances usually in reaction to some incident. If you follow Facebook, there was a thing that happened in Florida where they are actually going to people's houses and taking their dogs from the family because of dangerous dog ordinances. So these dogs, they were family pets and, you know, beloved of the children, were carted away. And it's amazing to me that people allowed them to cart their dogs away, but it got worked out. As you can well imagine their next step was to a lawyer as to how can you take my dog away.

I think that my colleagues really covered it. It's not that the dog itself is dangerous, it's the way the dog is treated. And they have cited the statistics for you, which I don't need to cite again. It's very clear that it's not the breed of the dog. It can be as I think somebody pointed out, a Chihuahua that can be the one that, you know, gets you.

Personally I have a Pit Bull that was rescued. My son who is an attorney in D.C., when he was in law school rescued this one from Ohio. Ohio does have a dangerous dog ordinance. And she was considered a dangerous dog simply because she was a Pit Bull. And what I say to my son, which he loves to repeat, I say that's like saying because I'm a blonde, I must be goofy which, of course, you know I'm not.

So Raquel, which is her name, he had her in law school, she had her own Facebook page, she wore her Catholic University Columbia School of Law little t-shirt around. And when he became a lawyer, it was impossible for her to keep her so he sent her up to me. And now I have her and she regularly gets beaten up by my Chihuahua Jack Russell rescue. And he could -- she could take him out in a heartbeat, and there's just not a mean bone in her body.

She plays with children, as you all know I have rescue horses, and I have kids on the place all the time, and she will play ball with them all day long. So is this -- is this proactive legislation? Yes, it is. But I think that it's good policy because there have been reactive incidences where municipalities have said they're going to do this. And there's this huge uproar, huge waste of energy as people have to bring this in front of a municipality yet again and say that it's not the breed, it's the person that handles that animal.

So I really appreciate you bringing this forward. Both the Chairmans, thank you very much. It means a lot to me that -- that this is in front of you and I would hope that you would vote it out favorably. And if there are

25 February 20, 2013
jmf/gbr PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT 10:00 A.M.
COMMITTEE

any questions, I'm glad to answer them.

REP. ROJAS: Thank you, Representative Urban.

Are there any questions for Representative?
Seeing none, thank you for your advocacy.

REP. URBAN: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO: Let me just say that we knew that
you would not stop pressuring us unless this
was on the agenda.

REP. URBAN: Now, Senator. Next you're going to
call me goofy.

REP. ROJAS: That was the last person on the public
officials list, so we're going to move on to
the public list.

And we'll begin with Raffie Podolski followed
by Charlotte Hitchcock followed by Bill Ethier.

RAPHAEL PODOLSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name
is Raphael Podolsky, I'm a Lawyer with the
Legal Assistance Resource Center in Hartford.
As part of legal aid programs, we represent
tenants -- local-income tenants in a variety of
circumstances. I'm here to speak in favor of
Senate Bill 819 which deals with the -- the
question of how -- how the courts handle a
situation where a tenant dies and the landlord
wants to get possession of the property back.

We have an existing statute from 2001, it's
47a-11d. And what happened last year was that
a landlord trying to reclaim -- trying to
reclaim the apartment discovered that there was
an ambiguity in the statute which resulted in
the clerk's office telling him he couldn't do
what I think the statute was intended to do.
That led to a working group of which I was a

SENATOR CASSANO: Right. And the key to this obviously is that -- the taxpayer pays both sides of the bill.

RONALD THOMAS: Exactly. Exactly. Again I mean some towns are doing a good job, you know, it kind of depends on the relationship -- the historical relationship between the town side and the education side, who the superintendent is, that sort of thing. But, you know, again this is a measure that we think is not heavy-handed and that really could make for some greater savings on the local level and help out the taxpayers.

SENATOR CASSANO: Thank you very much.

RONALD THOMAS: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO: Gordon Willard, John Filchak, and Joshua Ghiroli. Gordon Willard. John Filchak.

JOHN FILCHAK: Good afternoon, Senator Cassano, members of the Committee. My name is John Filchak, I'm the Executive Director of the Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments representing 12 towns. And I'm here today to talk about three bills, two of which deal with dogs. We operate a regional animal services program and have since 2004, and deal with hundreds of dogs each year.

HB 6323

HB 6334

And first I want to talk about 6311, the ACT PROHIBITING MUNICIPALITIES FROM ADOPTING BREED SPECIFIC DANGEROUS DOG ORDINANCES. We would support that because we see no correlation between breed and temperament. As I said, we deal with hundreds of dogs and whether they're small, large, Pit Bulls, mixed breeds, pure breeds, some bite, some don't. We're almost -- almost always it's the owner's fault, it's not

COMMITTEE

the dog's fault in terms of how it's been brought up, how it's been treated in terms of how dangerous it might get. So we agree with that bill.

Also on 6323, we would support that as well. We would very much like to be able to spay and neuter and do a complete vaccination and check on all of our animals. We're not currently -- we currently cannot do that for financial reasons, and this would give us a great option that we don't currently have. We would ask that it be expanded to cats as well and other domestic animals.

Cats, currently I think we have 35 or 40 cats at our facility and we deal with probably an equal amount of cats each year and would like to send all those out rabies vaccinated, spayed and neutered because we've got just an amazing feral cat population out there from unwanted cats. And we don't think that if we add that fee on that it would in any way hinder our ability to adopt out those animals. So for those reasons we would like to support those two.

And then briefly on proposed House Bill 6334 dealing with feasibility of regionalizing emergency dispatch functions, I submitted some written comments on that. And what I really reference with that is there was a study released last week by the Federal Reserve Bank in Boston that looked at regionalizing services, and they specifically looked at Connecticut and Massachusetts, and they looked at 9-1-1 centers.

And one of their conclusions, if we went from the current structure of a 109 separate systems to a county-based approach, we could save approximately 60 percent as a state. And so

them out in that condition.

REP. CANDELORA: Thank you. I appreciate that answer.

SENATOR CASSANO: We'll check that out and see what we can do on that. If it died and didn't come back, we'll resurrect it because it does make sense.

JOHN FILCHAK: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO: Joshua.

JOSHUA GHIROLI: Good afternoon. My name is Josh Ghiroli, I am a disabled vet and a proud Pit Bull owner. And I have written a letter on behalf of my dog today, so I will go on and read it. I am writing this letter on behalf of my dog, Kobe, who became a part of my family six years ago. He unfortunately isn't able to stand up for himself, ironically, to consider how far he and other Pit Bulls will go to stand up for their owners. So I could I refuse to protect a member of my family that has been a friend a more often than not, a pillow to my seven year-old-son, Dominic, as a carry blanket for my wife making her feel safe during my multiple deployments, and a loyal companion and TV watching buddy to me.

HB 6311

If Pit Bulls have one flaw, it's their eagerness to please their master, masters who sometimes take advantage of that loyalty by having their dogs fight other dogs. The problem with society is that all too often than not, society feels it should punish itself for the wrongdoing of a few. The same can be said about the punishment of an entire breed because of a few dogs. What's worse is it isn't even the dogs fault, it's their owners.

COMMITTEE

I could talk for hours about how wrong breed specific legislation is, but I obviously only have three minutes, and I shouldn't have. Breed specific legislation is discrimination, discrimination against an animal that does nothing more than love his owner. While I was serving, I dreaded every change of station that I had to do because I knew finding a place to live that would allow me to keep a member of my family would be difficult. But I never considered for a second getting rid of him. It was a burden I shouldn't have had to deal with.

Kobe is so sweet and doesn't deserve to be labeled because of what breed he is born. A man's best friend is a title that isn't only deserved, it is usually understated and we should be better friends to them. We shouldn't allow for media hype to affect the laws of an enlightened society. I think everybody here understands that -- that it's not the breed, it's the owner. And I think that that should facilitate the passing of this bill.

I also brought his picture so that I could put a face to the bill. It's my son, my dog Kobe and our ferret Lila who he adores. And that's all I have to say.

SENATOR CASSANO: Well, first of all, thank you for testifying. I did read your letter, and as people know, I'm one of those I don't like to have people read testimony. I'm glad you read your testimony. It says a lot about you and it says a lot about what this bill is about. We've gotten tremendous support in writing for the bill and a few to come forward and testify in person, the person behind writing the letter. I appreciate that very much.

JOSHUA GHIROLI: Absolutely, Senator.

COMMITTEE

Questions? Questions? Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO: Roberta Ventura.

Then it looks like Michelle Houston, Jeannie Ranalli, and Diana Good.

ROBERTA VENTURA: Good afternoon. My name is Roberta, I'm a Connecticut small business owner and a proud owner of two Pit Bull-type dogs. I respectfully ask you today to consider passing Connecticut Bill 6311 for the following reasons.

A dangerous dog is only a symptom of the real problem, irresponsible owners as well as cruel and criminal owners who damage dogs and make them dangerous. Breed specific legislation is an inappropriate response to the real problem. Pit Bulls are not the stereotypical devil dogs put forth in media messages. They are companion animals who have enhanced the lives of many through their devoted, people-loving nature, bravery, and intelligence.

Pit Bulls have served key roles in search and rescue, excelled in agility training, and worked nationwide as therapy and service dogs. As a whole, Pit Bulls have proven their stability and canine good citizenry, but sadly are the most abused, neglected, and persecuted dogs in the United States.

Here are a few reasons why breed specific legislation does not work. One, new DNA tests prove that visual identification of a dog breed is usually wrong. Pit Bull is not a breed, but rather a generic term used to describe the American Pit Bull Terrier, American Staffordshire Terrier, And Staffordshire Bull Terrier. However, the physical traits and characteristics shared by Pit Bulls are also

COMMITTEE

shared by approximately 25 other breeds that are not typically classified as Bull breeds.

Three, studies show that interactions of a broad complex of human-canine environmental factors contribute to dog bites regardless of breed. Instead of considered any type of BSL, I ask you to consider alternative ordinances as listed below. These are presently being used in Calgary, Canada, and are known as the Calgary Model. Their success rate has been highly praised. Education, just one of many things learned from the model by Calgary, Canada, is education is a key in preventing dog attacks, and promoting safer interactions between humans and dogs.

Research shows that just one hour of dog safety training in grades two and three reduces the attacks by 80 percent. Leash laws, enact, strengthen and enforce the laws. Quite frankly if a community cannot enforce the simplest of laws such as a leash law where there is no question as to whether a dog is or is not on a leash, how can they possibly expect to enforce a breed ban.

Hold owners accountable, strengthen and enforce penalties for irresponsible dog owners rather than create dangerous dog laws. We should instead focus on dangerous owners. Problem dogs are the result of irresponsible, neglected -- negligent and careless owners. Nonbreed specific legislation is cost effective in comparison to outright breed bans. More importantly, a well thought out, nonbreed specific legislation addresses the root cause of most if not all dog-related injuries and death which is irresponsible dog owners.

Strengthen animal abuse and dog-fighting laws. Dogs can be aggressive as a result of cruelty,

COMMITTEE

abuse, neglect, and otherwise improper care. Proper attention and stiffer penalties need to be focused on the owners who inflict these living conditions on their dogs. Regulate dog breeding, breeders pay an -- play an important role in the temperament of dogs. They -- that they sell -- I'm sorry, that they raise and sell. Irresponsible breeders or backyard breeders do not screen the individuals they sell their dogs too. You have the potential combination of ill-bred dogs in the hands of irresponsible owners is a disaster in the making.

Prevent low-cost spay and neuter options for communities. Providing low-cost options for spay and neuter services is an excellent way to help in many different areas including overcrowded shelters and day-to-day cost of running them. Micro-chipping a dog, if it's found to be dangerous, it should be required to be micro-chipped so that there is a permanent identification of the dog and it's owner.

As an owner of a breed -- as an owner of breeds targeted by BSL, the issue is very important to me wherever it comes up. I politely ask that you pass Bill 6311 and to consider the alternatives that I have supplied. Thank you for your time. Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO: Michelle. Jeannie. Terrific.

Pg 7

Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments

Testimony Regarding

Proposed Bill 6311

An Act Prohibiting Municipalities from
Adopting Breed Specific Dangerous Dog
Ordinances

Made To The

Planning And Development Committee

The Northeastern Connecticut Council Of Governments (NECCOG) supports the intent of this proposal and asks that the membership of the Committee give it favorable consideration.

NECCOG operates a regional Animal Services Program (the program began in 2004). Since that time we have adopted/placed/reunited more than 3,400 animals. Last year we dealt with more than 400 dogs of all shapes, breeds, sizes and temperaments. The majority of these dogs found good homes - only a few could not be placed because of their temperament. Based on our experience - we see no correlation between the breed of a dog and its propensity to be dangerous or a threat to people. More often than not it is the person responsible the dog that is responsible for a dogs dangerous behavior.

Thank you for your consideration of our position.

For More Information, please contact:

John Filchak
Executive Director
john.filchak@neccog.org
860-774-1253



NECCOG



Sen. Cassano, Rep. Rojas, Sen. Osten, Rep. Fox, Sen. Fasano, Rep. Aman and other distinguished members of the Planning and Development Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to deliver this testimony to your committee. My name is Gordon G. Willard and I am providing this testimony in support of HB6311 "An Act Prohibiting Breed Specific Dangerous Dog Ordinances".

I've worked for Connecticut Humane Society as Executive Director for two and a half years and in Animal Welfare for thirty years.

This proposal prohibits towns from crafting dangerous dog ordinances based upon breed. There are a number of problems when basing any legislation on breed and bite incidence information because breed identity is more often incorrect and statistical information about bites many times relates more to the popularity of a breed rather than the breed itself. A more popular breed means that there will be more of them in a population. When that happens, there may be more reported bites for that breed but that does not mean that that particular breed is more dangerous. It means that there are more of them and thus the number of bites may be higher.

According to the American Veterinary Medical Association Task Force on Canine Aggression and Human-Canine Interactions, data actually indicates that intact male dogs are involved in 70% to 76% of dog bite incidents. Intact (unneutered) male dogs represent 80% of dogs presented to veterinary behaviorists.

The AVMA's report indicates that a bite depends on at least five factors: heredity, early experience, later socialization and training, health and victim behavior. Breed is not listed as a determining factor and as recently proven through the use of DNA testing; trying to identify a breed type visually is many times not supported by the actual DNA information.

Dangerous dog laws should be carefully written to address the actual problems. These ordinances might better be called Dangerous Dog Owner Laws so that the behavior of the dog is the responsibility of the person who owns, trains, cares for and manages the dog.

Dangerous Dog laws must be mindful of the rights of pet owners and afford them due process. The laws should target the dogs that do pose a serious risk to animals and people and should include penalties for the owners as well.

If these laws are designed to reduce the incidence of bite incidences, they will not in and of themselves accomplish that goal. Reducing the number of dogs bites requires a much more comprehensive approach including proper reporting, community education and on-going monitoring which includes enforcement of strong yet fair minded dangerous dog ordinances not based upon breed.



Pg 3

State of Connecticut
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE CAPITOL
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

Representative Kim Rose
Assistant Majority Whip
118th Assembly District
Milford

Legislative Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut 06106
Capitol: (800) 842-8267
Cell (203) 701-6098
Kim Rose@cga.ct.gov

Testimony
Representative Kim Rose
HB 6311
118th District, Milford
February 2013

Chairman Cassano, Chairman Rojas, and Honorable members of the Planning and Development Committee, I am here to testify in strong support of HB 6311, An Act Prohibiting Municipalities from Adopting Breed Specific Dangerous Dog Ordinances.

I am here testifying before you today in support of this act on behalf of Lisa Taylor-Austin, who was unable to be present today. Breed Specific Legislation (BSL) has proven to not work. It is an emotional reaction to a *human*, not canine, situation. Unfortunately, pit bulls are the most abused and euthanized dog in America today. We have placed prejudicial notions onto pit bulls when, in fact, the responsibility should be placed on irresponsible owners. Over and over again, pit bulls are abused, tortured and murdered, due to the actions of humans. It has to stop.

Furthermore, BSL is costly and does not reduce dog bites. The United Kingdom's Dangerous Dog Act bans the American Pit Bull Terrier and three other breeds of dogs and their crossbreeds. Yet reports from the U.K. indicate that dog bites requiring hospital treatment have not decreased. Rather, 4,328 dog bites were reported treated by U.K. hospitals in 1999, whereas in the year ending April 2011 there were 6,118 such treatments—an increase of 41% over ten years [HES data]. The U.K. also continues to experience approximately four dog bite fatalities per year.

Some possible alternatives to BSL are containment laws, abuse prevention, safety education, spay and neuter assistance, breeder regulation, low cost training, and stiffer penalties for dog fighters, those who attend dog fights, and animal abuse. BSL is unnecessary and only punishes responsible dogs and owners. On behalf of Lisa Taylor-Austin, and myself, I urge you to join us in fully supporting proposed HB 6311.

I thank you for your consideration.

Lisa Taylor-Austin, NCC, LPC, LMHC, CFMHE, LLC
58 River Street - Suite 4
Milford, Connecticut 06460
203.522.6164

Expert Witness Services – Criminal Street Gangs Psychotherapy
Forensic Mental Health Evaluations Training and Education

www.gangcolors.com

February 20, 2013

STATEMENT TO THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
SUPPORTING

Proposed Bill No. 6311

Dear Senator Cassano, Representative Rojas, Vice-Chairs, Ranking Members and Members:

I am a psychotherapist in Connecticut and would like to be present to speak to you today but am unable due to my work schedule. I am licensed in CT and also NY and am nationally board certified. I am also the guardian (owner) of an American Pit bull Terrier (APBT).

Pit bull is not a breed but a catch phrase for three breeds: American Pit Bull Terrier, the American Staffordshire Terrier, the Staffordshire Bull Terrier. These three breeds are often the dogs most singled out by Breed Specific Legislation.

Breed Specific Legislation (BSL) has proven to not work. It is an emotional reaction to a *human*, not canine, situation. Unfortunately, pit bulls are the most abused and euthanized dog in America today. We have placed prejudicial notions onto pit bulls when, in fact, the responsibility should be placed on irresponsible owners. Over and over again, pit bulls are abused, tortured and murdered, due to the actions of humans. It has to stop.

The majority of pit bull owners are responsible, educated, citizens. Pit bulls were once revered nanny dogs, which were glorified during WWI and WWII. At least three United States Presidents have owned pit bulls. Pit Bulls are no more vicious than Golden Retrievers, Beagles or other popular dogs. In a recent study of 122 dog breeds by the American Temperament Testing Society (ATTS), Pit Bulls achieved a passing rate of 83.9%. That is better than Beagles at 78.2% and Golden Retrievers at 83.2%.

Another misnomer is that pit bulls have locking jaws. Pit Bulls cannot lock their jaws. If one reviews x-rays of a Chihuahua and compare it to that of a Pit Bull, you will see that

they are both the same except for the size difference. Other breeds of dogs have a stronger pound for pound pressure bite, yet it is the pit bull that is vilified.

Facts

BSL does not reduce dog bites.

The United Kingdom's Dangerous Dog Act bans the American Pit Bull Terrier and three other breeds of dogs and their crossbreeds. Yet reports from the U.K. indicate that dog bites requiring hospital treatment have not decreased. Rather, 4,328 dog bites were reported treated by U.K. hospitals in 1999, whereas in the year ending April 2011 there were 6,118 such treatments—an increase of 41% over ten years [HES data]. The U.K. also continues to experience approximately four dog bite fatalities per year.

In June 2008, the Netherlands passed the repeal of their 15-year-long ban on pit bulls due to its failure to ensure public safety. Dog bites continued to rise in spite of the ban. The government is now looking into behavior-based, rather than breed-based, legislation.

Spain passed the Dangerous Animals Act in 2000, placing restrictions on nine breeds of dogs and dogs possessing "characteristics" of those breeds. A scientific study analyzing dog bites reported to the Aragon health department during a five year period before the Act was passed (1995 to 1999) and the five year period after passage (2000 to 2004) found that there was no significant difference in the number of dog bites in Spain before or after the Dangerous Animals Act passed.

Furthermore, the study found that the most popular breeds (none of which were targeted by the legislation) were responsible for the most bites both before and after passage of the BSL. The targeted breeds accounted for a very small portion of bites both before and after passage of the BSL. The scientists concluded that there was no rational basis for Spain's BSL.

BSL is costly.

In 2001, a Baltimore, Maryland, auditor estimated it would cost \$750,000 to enforce a breed-specific ban.

In 2008, Omaha proposed BSL that would cost over half a million dollars to enforce.

The United Kingdom's Dangerous Dog Act, which includes a ban on certain breeds of dogs, is estimated to have cost well over \$14 million to enforce between the years 1991 and 1996 (no more recent numbers are available). It has come under fire lately as dog bites (committed by non-targeted dogs) rise despite the ban.

Even small cities and communities can spend tens of thousands of dollars annually to uphold their BSL.

As if administrative costs are not enough of a burden, lawsuits are par for the course when BSL is passed. Lawsuits are filed because:

- Owners of targeted breeds feel that BSL violates the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution
- Dog owners dispute the breed designation that an animal control officer or shelter worker has placed on their dog
- A municipality's breed-specific legislation contradicts state law
- Breed-specific legislation violates the federal Americans with Disabilities Act

Lawsuits can cost taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars and place a heavy burden on both the court system and animal control departments. Often, these lawsuits are brought about by responsible dog owners whose family dogs were confiscated simply because of their appearance, not their behavior. Such lawsuits further underline the high cost and senselessness of BSL.

There is difficulty with identifying breeds.

Seventy-five percent or more of the U.S. canine population without any sort of traceable lineage. Some of these dogs are undoubtedly purebred, though they may lack any sort of historical paper trail to prove it. Their appearance is close enough to a breed standard that owners can confidently say that their dog is of a specific breed.

The vast majority of canines, however, are mixed breed dogs. And though we tend to think of mixed breed dogs as the offspring of two purebred dogs (Mastiff x Boxer = Mastiff-Boxer mix), the reality is far more complex. Most mixed breed dogs are a genetic mishmash resulting from several generations of mixed breed dogs interbreeding. The end result is incredibly complex.

To make things more confusing, a dog that doesn't really meet any single breed standard may be categorized as a type of dog rather than a specific breed. Dogs may be identified as terriers, pit bulls, shepherds, or retrievers; none of these are actual breed names, and the breeds that really do make up these categories come in a startling variety of shapes, sizes, and colors. There's a huge difference between an Airedale Terrier and a Jack Russell Terrier, so what does a "terrier mix" describe?

BSL targets breeds, not behaviors. Responsible, trained, family dogs are targeted as being "dangerous" just because they are alive. Behavior is not taken into consideration. Families, who license their dogs, train them, exercise them, abide by all laws are punished for owning a dog that is or appears to be of a certain breed. This breedism is a direct correlation to racism. It is no different than making African-American's slaves because of the color of their skin. Certain dogs would be deemed "dangerous" purely based on appearance. Does Connecticut want to be known as the breedist state?

Massachusetts passed Massachusetts S.219. It states, "No city or town shall regulate in a manner specific to breed." Connecticut must follow suit! BSL is not the answer to any dog problem. *We must hold our municipalities responsible for their lack of enforcement of responsible ownership laws which already exist!*

Banning breeds creates a host of problems. For example:

1. The United Kingdom has BSL. In 2012 the Belfast City Council sentenced a dog named, Lennox, to death. He was a service dog to a disabled child. He was proven not to be "of breed" by DNA tests. He was murdered anyway because government officials, without any knowledge of dogs decided to murder him. There was a massive outcry around the world against this. I don't think Connecticut wishes to be the focus of such scrutiny in the future, or viewed as such a vile place to live.
2. Animal advocates around the globe focus attention through the media, and social networking on towns, cities and states that have BSL. Officials are constantly barraged with negative public attention.

Alternatives to BSL are containment laws, abuse prevention, safety education, spay and neuter assistance, breeder regulation, low cost training, and stiffer penalties for dog fighters, those who attend dog fights, and animal abuse.

BSL is a costly draconian idea that serves no purpose. It punishes responsible dogs and owners. If BSL was ever passed in my city or state, I would move, even if it meant walking away from my property. Many pit bull owners feel the same way. Not only does BSL cost tax payer dollars to implement, but the tax base to the city and state is lost when people move out due to breed specific legislation.

I fully support Proposed Bill No. 6311. We are smart enough to think of more humane, compassionate ways to treat our state's family pets.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lisa Taylor-Austin

Sources:

The Pit bull Placebo, Delise K., 2007, Anubis Publishing.

Interesting Facts about BSL

Public Service Announcement, <http://vimeo.com/53622294>

www.stopbsl.org

Interesting Facts About BSL

Think only "those" dogs bite?

There is a misconception that BSL consistently targets the type or breed of dog most responsible for bites

Redding, California bite statistics for 2006

- Number one biter Labrador Retriever (22 bites)
- Number one breed causing major wounds Blue Heeler (8 major bites, 11 total bites)
- Pit bull statistics: 13 bites total, 9 minor, 4 major
- Jack Russell Terrier 12 bites total, 9 minor, 3 major

New South Wales bite statistics for 2006

- Top three biting breeds German Shepherds, Cattle dogs, Rottweilers

In Iowa

For three years in a row, Labrador Retrievers have topped the bite list

Victoria, Australia

Between 1997-1999, 700 attacks were reported. Forty-six breeds were identified

- German Shepherd 127 attacks
- Cattle dog: 90 attacks

Rottweilers, Kelpies, Labrador Retrievers, Staffordshire Bull Terriers, Bull Terriers, Crossbreeds, Dobermans, Boxers, Jack Russell Terriers, and Rhodesian Ridgebacks bit more frequently than the American Pit Bull Terrier (21 bites)

Does BSL work?

The basic premise behind BSL is that it will reduce the rate and frequency of dog bites inflicted on humans (based on the assumption that certain types of dogs are more dangerous and bite more frequently than other breeds of dogs).

In April of 2007, Middletown lifted its two year ban of pit bulls

Pit Bulls accounted for 5% of bites...the same percentage of bites before and now after the ban. From April 2007 - October 2007, pit bulls have only bitten twice

UK Study

In the UK, four breeds of dogs are banned (including the American Pit Bull Terrier

Number of bites BEFORE the breed ban. 99 in a three-month period.

Percentage of bites by pit bulls BEFORE the breed ban. 3%
Number of bites 2 years AFTER the breed ban: 99 in a three-month period.

Percentage of bites by pit bulls AFTER the breed ban 5%
In this case, the number of bites did not decrease after the breed ban AND the number of bites by a prohibited breed increased

In June of 2007, the number of hospitalizations from dog bites has doubled since the implementation of the 1991 Dangerous Dog Act

Another premise of BSL is that there IS a "dangerous breed" problem, i.e. certain types of dogs bite more and should be regulated. Traditionally, pit bulls and Rottweilers have been targeted

In another UK study

Percentage of bites by THREE breeds (American Pit Bull Terrier, Rottweiler, Doberman) BEFORE BSL 6%
Percentage of bites by German Shepherd BEFORE BSL 24%
German Shepherds are not banned

In Winnipeg

1989. 31% of dog bites committed by German Shepherds and their crosses, only 9% committed by pit bulls and their mixes. Pit bulls banned.

Denver, Colorado

Pit bulls have, for the most part, been banned for nearly 20 years. When asked if the ban has been effective, Denver director of animal control, Doug Kelley, "People ask me a whole bunch whether the pit bull ordinance is effective and my answer is, I don't know."

Edmonton, Canada

- Since a 1997 implementation of breed restriction, 4 breeds have the same bite rate as pit bulls and 11 breeds exceed the number of bites inflicted by pit bulls

Kitchener/Waterloo

- Number of pit bull bites: 18. Number of German Shepherd bites: 85 - Pit bulls banned

Perth County, Ontario

- Dog bite statistics compiled since January 2002 show just 1% of bites attributed to 'pit bulls'. One third of reported bites were caused by mixed breed dogs, and the top five biting breeds were Chow Chow, Jack Russell Terrier, Labrador Retriever, Dachshund, and Rottweiler

Ottawa, Ontario

Of the nearly 900 reports of bite incidents in Ottawa, Ontario for the last three years, only five were attributable to pit bulls. The largest number of bite incidents involved Black Labrador Retrievers and Golden Retrievers

Is BSL good for taxpayers?

The cost of enforcing breed specific legislation is often high, especially since resources are wasted on calls from "concerned neighbors" regarding possible banned breed presence

London, Ontario

The province of Ontario banned pit bulls in 2005

- Percentage of licensed pit bulls 4%
- Percentage of time (and money) animal control spends on pit bull related calls 25%
- Percent of money spent on enforcing ban 10% or \$170,000 per year

Windsor, Canada

- An extra \$26,000 each year is spent on enforcing a pit bull ban

United Kingdom's Dangerous Dog Act of 1991

- Cost for IDENTIFYING pit bulls: \$14 million - Yearly costs in litigation \$10 million

Cincinnati, Ohio

- During a 10-year period, the city spent \$160,000 per year trying to enforce a pit bull ban

But, wait; aren't pit bulls statistically more likely to kill compared to their population size?

According to registries (UKC, AKC, ADDBA), there are approximately 5 million pit bulls in the United States. The CDC study reported 60 fatalities attributed to "pit bull type dogs" - statistically, that is 0.0012% of the breed population (0.00009% of the total dog population). Chows, according to the CDC report killed 12 people - statistically the fatality rate of Chows is 705% of the breed population

Are there effective alternatives?

In Calgary, CA there is no breed ban. Instead of creating more laws, existing leash laws and licensing requirements were more stringently enforced. An effective education outreach campaign was initiated. Dog bites dropped 70% and the number of dogs licensed now stands at 90%. That's huge! As a comparison, most license rates are below 20% in the United States



DEPARTMENT OF VETERAN AFFAIRS
VA Connecticut Healthcare System
950 Campbell Avenue
West Haven, CT 06516

HB 6311

February 20, 2013

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to you regarding Breed Specific Legislation or, BSL. I am a physician practicing in the New Haven area, a Clinical Professor at Yale University. I first encountered BSL while researching what kind of dog I would like to get after my beloved greyhound passed away. The qualities I was looking for were intelligence, size (smaller than our Greater Swiss Mt dog) and rugged so the dog would be able to accompany me on my frequent hikes in the White Mountains and over nights on the Appalachian trail.

Pretty quickly this dog called "pit bull" attracted my attention. One of the first things I came to understand was that there is no "pit bull" breed. It is really a descriptive term used to characterize dogs with a muscular body, big head, short coat and thin tail. Many dog breeds, including but not exclusive of the Staffordshire Terrier, American Staffordshire Terrier, American Pit Bull Terrier and sometimes the Cane Corso and Presa Canario can be characterized as "pit bulls". Lumping all these dogs together is no different really than saying that all people with dark skin are African American.

My research has shown me that when BSL is enacted, education for law enforcers is spent on teaching them how to recognize this non-existent "pit bull". Rather than utilizing precious resources to educate about dog behavior/temperament and how to manage potential volatile situations, they are schooled in how to identify dogs that are frequently no more than someone's family pet.

The dog I chose to bring into my family was surrendered to a high kill shelter in NYC. Luckily for both of us, he was found by a CT rescue group. Not encumbered by any BSL, I was able to open my home to this friendly, playful, whip smart little guy that is a fabulous companion. He loves everything he meets and will one day make a fabulous therapy dog.

We need to nip BSL in the bud. We know better than to judge humans by the way they look. We owe it to "man's best friend" to treat him with the same regard!

Sincerely,

Dr Kathleen Lazzarini

Testimony Concerning HB #3611HB 6311

To prohibit towns from addressing the issue of dangerous dogs in a breed specific manner.

Elizabeth B. Gardner
Registered voter in Fairfield, CT
Professor Emerita, Fairfield University (Psychology)

I would like to thank the Joint Committee on Planning and Development for the opportunity to express my support of **HB #3611**: To prohibit towns from addressing the issue of dangerous dogs in a breed specific manner.

I am a registered voter in Fairfield, CT, and I am Professor Emerita, Fairfield University (Psychology) and a member of the Town of Fairfield's Committee to develop a Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.

My husband and I have adopted two pit bulls from the Fairfield Animal Shelter, Baba ("Mom Dog") and Lola. Each was wonderful, loving and gentle; each thought she was entitled to sit in our laps (see photo of me and Lola).

There has been a great deal of misinformation and scare journalism about pit bulls (American Staffordshire Terriers; "shelter dogs"). An internet meme pictures a "pit bull attack" as pit bull dogs licking the faces of happy kids.

This bill needs to be passed to prevent tragic waste and greatly unfair sadnesses. Pit bulls are wonderful dogs! We plan to adopt another one soon (we lost Lola to leptospirosis [from the flood?] less than a month ago). Please remember Lola (in the photo) and please pass this bill!

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to testify and I hope you will pass this important piece of legislation!

Thank you,

Elizabeth B. Gardner
882 Reef Rd.
Fairfield, CT 06824
gardner@fairfield.edu
203 256 1035



PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

February 20, 2013

Pg 7

The Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM) is Connecticut's statewide association of towns and cities and the voice of local government - your partners in governing Connecticut. Our members represent over 92% of Connecticut's population. We appreciate the opportunity to testify on bills of interest to towns and cities.

HB 6311, "An Act Prohibiting Municipalities from Adopting Breed Specific Dangerous Dog Ordinances"

CCM opposes this bill.

HB 6311 seems to unnecessarily tie the hands of municipal officials, preventing them from enacting measures that they believe are best to help ensure the health and safety of their community. It should be noted that any measure adopted by a municipality is done so after a very public and accessible process.

CCM urges the Committee to take no action on this bill.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★

If you have any questions, please contact Ron Thomas at rthomas@ccm-ct.org or 203-498-3000.



Pg 1

State of Connecticut

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STATE CAPITOL

REPRESENTATIVE BRENDA L. KUPCHICK
ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-SECOND ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING ROOM 4200
300 CAPITOL AVENUE
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591

TOLL FREE (800) 842-1423
CAPITOL (860) 240-8700
HOME (203) 336-1724
Brenda.Kupchick@cga.ct.gov

MEMBER
HOUSING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE

Testimony

In support of H.B. 6311

An Act Prohibiting Municipalities from Adopting Breed Specific Dangerous Dog Ordinances

Planning and Development Committee
February 20, 2013

Dear Senator Cassano, Senator Fasano, Rep. Rojas, and Rep. Aman and members of the Planning and Development Committee:

I come before you today in strong support of 6311, An Act Prohibiting Municipalities from Adopting Breed Specific Dangerous Dog Ordinances. For the past twenty years I have worked with rescues, have fostered dogs, and volunteered with various shelters. In my experience BSL would be very harmful to the breeds it attempts to control, unfairly targets specific breeds, and has limited statistical data to back up its claim.

Pit Bulls are one of the breeds targeted by this legislation. However, Pit bulls are scientifically less vicious dogs than other breeds. In a recent study of 122 dog breeds by the American Temperament Testing Society (ATTS), Pit Bulls achieved a passing rate of 83.9% - better than Beagles at 78.2% and Golden Retrievers at 83.2%.

In addition, many owners of targeted breeds feel that BSL violates the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and its due process clause, as well as the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act. Furthermore, there are many alternatives to BSL such as safety education, spay and neuter assistance, breeder regulation, low cost training, and stiffer penalties for those who abuse animals.

Some examples to back up my claims:

In 2001, a Baltimore, Maryland, auditor estimated it would cost \$750,000 to enforce a breed-specific ban.

In 2008, Omaha proposed BSL that would cost over half a million dollars to enforce.

The United Kingdom's Dangerous Dog Act, which includes a ban on certain breeds of dogs, is estimated to have cost well over \$14 million to enforce between the years 1991 and 1996 (no more recent numbers are available). It has come under fire lately as dog bites (committed by non-targeted dogs) rise despite the ban.

BSL is a costly idea that does not serve a pragmatic purpose. It punishes responsible dogs and owners by unfairly targeting certain breeds, and essentially casts a death sentence for the dogs it targets.

I fully support Proposed Bill No. 6311 and I believe that together we can establish a more compassionate way to treat our state's family pets.

Brenda L. Kupchick

S - 664

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL. 56
PART 13
3813 - 4129**

Mr. Clerk, will you call the roll call vote again please? Thank you.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Senators to the Chamber. Immediate roll call ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, if all members have voted, the machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk will you call the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5836.

Total Number Voting	35
Necessary for Adoption	18
Those voting Yea	35
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

The bill passes.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 19, Calendar 556, House Bill Number 6311, AN ACT PROHIBITING THE MUNICIPALITIES FROM ADOPTING BREED SPECIFIC DOG ORDINANCES, Favorable Report of the Committee on PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Yes, again, Madam President, I move adoption of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption and passage.

Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR CASSANO:

Yes. A very simple bill. This is an act that prohibits municipalities from adopting breed specific dogs. You cannot pass an ordinance, according to this that provides -- that specifies a certain breed.

I have to say that this was probably one of the most fun public hearings that we've had in P and D. As people came in with many of their photographs of their pit bulls in the cribs with their babies and they're playing on the floor and everything else. It was a lesson to us. It's not the dog, it's the -- it's the dog owner.

And so I would urge adoption of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Will anybody remark further?

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, through you.

Some questions to the proponent.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President.

Can you tell me if any municipalities now have or are contemplating any sort of breed specific language or - or laws or ordinances?

Through you, Madam President.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Do I know --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Through you, Madam President.

Do I know of specifically any that have them? No. I do know that some have contemplated using them. I understand there are some. I just don't know where they would be.

THE CHAIR:

Senator --

SENATOR CASSANO:

I know there are some in clearly other parts of the country for sure. There was much about that, but I don't know -- I know there are some towns that are doing it, I just don't know which ones they are.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President.

And again, through you.

These sorts of ordinances that maybe passed in, perhaps, other cities outside of the state of Connecticut, do they -- can the gentleman tell me if they expressly allow certain breeds? Is it breed specific or is it a prohibition or not of a particular breed in most cases?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

It is -- it is.

Through you, Madam President.

It is not specific to any certain breeds. It includes all breeds. So a pit bull and a cocker spaniel and a golden retriever are treated the same.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President.

So breed specific legislation, I assume, would be -- I'll arbitrarily pick a city, the city of Baltimore may decide that pit bulls, for instance are dangerous dogs, so they may choose to prohibit people from -- is it owning pit bulls within the city limits?

SENATOR CASSANO:

Owning.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Yes. The two dogs that have been discussed the most are rottweilers and pit bulls. And there was much evidence provided that, in fact, many could be good dogs if treated correctly.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President.

And again, through you.

So in those cases where municipalities do consider this sort of legislation, is it generally the prohibition of ownership or do they consider other things, such as if you did own a pit bull and you were outside with it, it may need a -- for instance it may need a muzzle. Something -- something like that.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Through you, Madam President.

The bill is specific as to the ownership of the dog. There are municipalities that have leash laws and a variety of different laws, which (inaudible) all dogs, not necessarily a specific breed.

This is a specific breed ownership.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President.

So if this bill were to pass, then the city of -- or the town of New Milford could not enact an ordinance that would prohibit anybody with -- any resident from owning a particular breed of dog? Is that correct?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

That is correct.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President.

And again, through you.

Could the municipality, although they would be prohibited from prohibiting a certain ownership of a certain breed, could they make some other regulation that's breed specific, such as we can't prohibit you from owning a pit bull, but we can require you to muzzle that pit bull when it's out in public.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

That's -- I don't know the legal answer to that. I think that would -- I know you can have a leash law.

I don't know of a community that would pass a leash law that is specific to a pit bull, because even defining the pit bull can be difficult or a Rottweiler or -- we've had two years of headlines of a Golden Retriever who bit somebody. So I don't know how we would do that, but it would be contrary to what the purpose of the law is.

The law simply involves the ownership of the dog.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President.

I don't mean to pick on pit bulls. Why don't we switch to miniature dachshunds? I own one of those. So --

THE CHAIR:

So sweet.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Not always, Madam President.

Could the municipality -- would the passage of this law, I think it's clear. I think you and I agree that the municipality couldn't pass something that would prohibit me from owning a miniature dachshund, in this particular case, but what isn't clear to me is, could the municipality say those breeds -- a miniature dachshund could be a snippy little dog, and if you're going to take it to the dog park, it's got to have a muzzle on it?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Again, I don't know if municipalities could pass that kind of a breed specific dog park rule, as an example. Many of us have dog parks. Many of us have requirements for muzzles for dogs. No free roaming for dogs, but it's dogs. I have never seen one, to my knowledge anyway, that is that specific.

There are some places, I understand -- I know my daughter -- I have a daughter who lives in California who goes to a dog park. There's a dog park where, I guess it might be breed specific, where pit bulls and others who are bigger dogs go. There are dog parks -- dog parks for bigger dogs and smaller dogs and so on, so I imagine any of those things could happen, but this bill just simply says you cannot deny someone from owning a dog because they happen to be a certain kind. Simply the ownership.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN.

Thank you, Madam President.

And Boomer, if he's watching this at home, will be pleased to hear that.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator -- will -- will you remark further?

Senator Cassano.

Will you remark further?

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Madam President.

I've just listened to Senator Chapin ask a few questions of Senator Cassano. And I know Senator Cassano has, I think, clearly stated that he understands that this -- this bill would prevent a municipality from putting in an ordinance that would preclude somebody from owning a particular breed, but I guess if -- when -- when I look at the language, and maybe this is why Senator Chapin asked so many questions. I'm -- I'm not quite sure I reach that same conclusion and so I'm hoping he can help me work through this.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Sure.

SENATOR WELCH:

Line 4 states that -- it looks like we only have a piece of the statute here -- that they can regulate and prohibit the going at large of dogs and other animals in the streets and public places of the municipality and they can prevent cruelty to animals in all inhuman sports, except no municipality shall adopt breed specific dog ordinances.

Now when I read that in the abstract, I think I come to the conclusion that maybe Senator Chapin had come to and was the cause of his questions, is that it doesn't matter what the regulation is that a municipality proposes or the ordinance is that a municipality proposes to adopt. Whatever it is, it cannot be breed specific.

And so if Senator Cassano could maybe help me work through this language so I can come to his understanding.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Sure.

SENATOR WELCH:

Through you, Madam President.

I would great appreciate that.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Well you read it as I've read it. Regulate, prohibit the going at large of dogs. Going at large is the leash law. We have requirements of muzzling. We have, you know, we do have restrictions on dogs, but they're not breed specific restrictions. And that's where it says except, but no municipality shall adopt breed specific dog ordinances. So to have a leash law that only involves golden retrievers or cocker spaniels, or dachshunds would be against the law, but you can have a leash law.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Okay. Thank you, Madam President.

I -- I think I get that. Maybe one more question might help me.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Madam President.

I was reading this transcript. So back to where Senator Chapin was going let's expand it beyond a leash law, would you be able to require a particular breed to be muzzled?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

It would -- I don't -- I can't give you a legal answer to that, first of all. I never pretended to be an attorney.

Second of all, this is the ownership and we know that it can regulate dogs. I can't imagine that they can pass or as a former mayor, I can't imagine passing something that would say that this -- this is only for this type of dog or that type of dog. I just don't see how you could do that.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Madam President.

I appreciate Senator Cassano's --

THE CHAIR:

Oh, sorry Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

That's fine.

I appreciate Senator Cassano's understanding of the bill and I thank you for the time he's given me. I'm not sure that -- that it's as clear as I would like it to be to me, but hopefully, with what Senator Cassano stated on the floor, which I understand to be you can't pass a breed specific or leash law ordinance. Hopefully, that will be clear enough to everybody else.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

Senator -- I'm sorry.

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Hello.

I don't have any --

Hello, Madam President.

I don't have any questions for the proponent, but I am going to be voting no. I respect the public hearing that the Planning and Development Committee had. And maybe it's an incorrect assumption that there's some dogs that are inherently vicious, but I think if a municipality conducts a study and the public safety of that municipality is such that they maybe want to say Dobermans have to be treated a certain way, or pit bulls have to be treated a certain way, I can't tell you the number of stories that I've read nationally where some of these dogs and the breed of dog comes up over and over and over again, do just vicious things to adults and children. And so I leave that to my local municipalities to make that decision.

So with the utmost respect to Chairman Cassano, I will be voting no.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Yes, Madam President.

Will you remark?

Senator Cassano.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, Madam Chair. I do understand the reluctance and the questions and I appreciate the questions and questions that we had in Committee.

As a dog owner, we've raised over 100 golden retrievers. You can't imagine what it felt like for us, my wife and I, when we had the story of the golden retriever who bit the baby. It was a dog. It was an incident. They happen.

We also -- many times you'll hear us talking about various laws involving delinquency and so on and we talk about the role of parents. The role of parents is not much different than the role of the dog owner and how they raise the dog. If we raise the dog to be -- to kill chickens, if we raise the dog to fight, if we raise the dog to be a vicious guard dog, that's what the dog is going to be. And this is where we ourselves have to have some responsibility. The dog is not born to be, necessarily something bad. The dog comes in and it's up to us as to what it's going to be. And that was the purpose of the bill and the background.

And so I would -- I -- I know there's opposition, so I would ask for a roll call vote if there's no other discussion.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

If not, at this time, Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call vote and the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you call the roll call vote again please? Thank you.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Senators to the Chamber. Immediate roll call ordered
in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you do one more roll call vote,
please?

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, all members have voted, the
machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk will you call the amend -- call the bill.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 6311

Total Number Voting	34
Necessary for Adoption	18
Those voting Yea	30
Those voting Nay	4
Those absent and not voting	2

THE CHAIR:

The bill passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Madam President, if we might return to the item that
was passed temporarily earlier.

That is Calendar Page 40, Calendar 265, Senate Bill
191, from the Transportation Committee.

Thank you, Madam President.