

**PA13-236**

HB6591

House	7182-7237, 10600-10605	62
Public Health	3799-3803, 4322-4330, 4814-4825, 4856	27
Senate	5154-5159	6
		<b>95</b>

**H – 1170**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2013**

**VOL.56  
PART 21  
6911 – 7260**

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

235  
May 29, 2013

Have all Members voted? Have all Members voted?  
Would the Members please check the board to determine  
if your vote is properly cast.

If all Members have voted, the machine will be  
locked and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk  
will please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Substitute House Bill 6694 as amended by House  
"A".

Total Number Voting	146
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	136
Those voting Nay	10
Those absent and not voting	4

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The bill as amended is passed.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 364.

THE CLERK:

On Page 45, Calendar Number 364, Favorable Report  
of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary,  
Substitute House Bill 6591 AN ACT REQUIRING THE  
EUTHANIZATIN OF ANY CAT OR DOG TO BE PERFORMED BY A  
LICENSED VETERINARIAN.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

236  
May 29, 2013

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Good afternoon. Madam, may I interrupt you for a moment? Will the Chamber please lower the volume so that we can hear the proponent of the bill. Thank you, Madam, you may proceed.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Johnson, you have the Floor, madam.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This bill is to require that most circumstances that the euthanasia of a dog or a cat is performed by a licensed veterinarian under the supervision of a licensed veterinarian, so I move adoption.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

237  
May 29, 2013

And Madam Speaker, I have an amendment and I'd like to be granted leave of the Chair to summarize the amendment, and it's LCO Number 8113.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Would the Clerk please, I'm sorry, would the Clerk please read LCO 8113, which will be designated House Amendment "A".

THE CLERK:

House Amendment "A", LCO 8113 introduced by Representative Johnson et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection? Representative Johnson, you have, I'm sorry, you may proceed with summarization, madam.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a very simple Amendment. There has been a lot of discussion about making sure the language is clear and this Amendment merely makes sure that the language is clear, that organizations that have a license through the Department of Public Health to perform research or that otherwise allowed to perform euthanization

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

238  
May 29, 2013

services under the supervision of a veterinarian like the Humane Society, are able to continue to do these things. This does not repeal any of the other existing statutes that govern this activity.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

I move adoption of the Amendment as well.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you, madam. The question before the Chamber is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Would you remark further? Will you remark further? Representative Camillo of the 151st.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, how are you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

How are you, sir?

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Pretty good, thank you. I rise in strong support of this bill. I want to thank Representative Johnson for the work she did on this and everybody else who had worked on what has become known as the Buddy Bill and hopefully one day it will be Buddy's Law.

It's been about three years in the making. It started from, originated from an incident in Middlefield, Connecticut, where a German Shepherd dog

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

239  
May 29, 2013

was shot in the head and unfortunately, we've had many incidents since then, and this really clarifies what the law is and as --

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Excuse me, sir. Would the Chamber please lower the volume so that we may hear the Representative's remarks? Thank you. You may proceed, sir.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And what this does is clarifies, as Representative Johnson said, it does not conflict with existing statutes and it also has about four carve outs in it so that if you know, a dog was put down by law enforcement or if it was a farm animal or if there were exigent circumstances where an attack was in place or if an animal had a life-threatening injury or condition and you couldn't get them there to the vet, then you could put the animal down humanely.

So it's a great bill and certainly a lot of people around the state were asking for it and hopefully we can get unanimous support. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you, sir. Representative Miner of the 66th.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

240  
May 29, 2013

REP. MINER (66th):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker. Mom would be very proud today.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

I know mom would, brother Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Madam Speaker, I have a couple of questions, if I might, through you to the proponent of the Amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would draw the gentle lady's attention to Section C on Line 18 where there appears to be an exception to the bill where the bill in the majority calls for the euthanization to be performed by a licensed veterinarian, but in this section it seems to, I guess to use the phrase already used, a carve out for someone else to put an animal down without the use of a veterinarian for certain circumstances.

Is that correct as the gentle lady reads the bill?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

241  
May 29, 2013

Representative Johnson, will you respond, madam?

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, yes, that's correct. If there's a life-threatening injury or other condition, some exigent circumstance, then in that circumstance there would not be any prosecution to follow.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Miner, you still have the Floor, sir.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and not being an attorney, I'm trying to get a sense as to how that actually plays into Section B where there's a series of penalties, one being a fine of up to \$1,000, the other being of imprisonment for not more than a year.

And so in terms of the defense to prosecution, is that a claim that would be made, let's say by the dog's owner at the time someone might investigate such an event where a dog may be put down privately by someone who owns the dog?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

242  
May 29, 2013

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, could the good Representative please repeat that question because I didn't hear the very end of what he was saying?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Miner, would you please repeat the question, sir?

REP. MINER (66th):

Certainly, Madam Speaker. So as an example, if I had made the determination that my dog was suffering and chose to end the dog's life at that point myself, in terms of it being a defense of prosecution, is that a defense that would be made should my neighbor call the police and the police investigate right at that point, or is it farther down the line? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

It would really depend on what the evidence and the record shows. If the police chose to charge the person with the offense of illegal euthanization, it would depend on what the facts of the record actually

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

243  
May 29, 2013

stated, whether or not the facts demonstrated exigent circumstances.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Miner, you still have the Floor, sir.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And so, it would really be up to the individual that was involved then to be prepared to describe what the condition was or what the life-threatening injury was as that individual knew it to the agency or police department that was investigating then.

Is that not correct? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

That's correct, Madam Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

And so, if that were the case and for instance, if I knew my dog had incurable cancer and had chosen that method rather than some other method to put the

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

244  
May 29, 2013

dog's suffering aside, is that the point at which I make the claim and therefore there is no further prosecution? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I think this bill envisions some type of, perhaps, emergency situation where an animal is perhaps struck by an automobile for example, or has some other unfortunate severe injury that it's suffering in pain at the time with horrible pain that would not be remedied and the distance to the veterinarian would be too far.

So I think that that's the kind of thing that we're envisioning in this statute. I think that generally, as a general rule when you think of some, an animal who is suffering with cancer, generally the veterinarian makes the determination, gives you a certain period of time to make a decision about when the euthanization should occur and in that circumstance, a peaceful euthanization should be able to be carried out without having to perform that on the animal yourself. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

245  
May 29, 2013

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I do appreciate the gentle lady's description of how this would work.

Madam Speaker, I have great compassion for the same animals that Representative Camillo does. I think the concern that he has raised over the last number of years has really made it clear to me that there are some circumstances where we should be trying to afford some protection for an animal and there are other avenues.

Certainly, I think his example is one where it may very well have been that someone else would have adopted the dog, or it may very well have been that there was another option.

I am still concerned a bit about the way this section is drafted and for that reason, I will not be in support of the bill primarily because it was my hope that the word condition would have provided an opportunity for a caring animal owner, perhaps on a Sunday afternoon when the veterinarian wasn't open and it would have been a long ride somewhere else, to manage the situation and end the kind of suffering

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

246  
May 29, 2013

that I think many of us from time to time see with our  
pets.

And so for that reason I'll be opposing it, but I  
absolutely understand the compassion with which  
Representative Camillo and others have pursued this  
legislation and I want to thank them for bringing it  
to us.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you, sir. Representative Srinivasan of the  
31st.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

I, too, rise in strong support of this bill  
amended, which obviously going forward will be the  
bill on which we will be voting.

As I look through this bill as amended, we have  
taken care of multiple situations a) by and large when  
the dog or the cat need to be euthanized, doing it the  
right way by a licensed veterinarian.

But we also have taken into account other situations that could arise, and in those situations the obvious exemptions have been made, so in that way it is definitely complete.

I want to thank our Chairwoman of the Public Health Committee for her work on this bill. I want to thank my colleague, Representative Camillo for bringing this to our attention so that we were able to process it in our committee.

Through you, Madam Speaker, if I can just ask a couple of questions to the proponent of the Amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Through you, Madam Speaker, Line 5 talks about a licensed veterinarian and in many veterinarian offices they have training people under their guidance as well. So would, if this bill were to pass, is it possible that under a licensed veterinarian the actual act can be done by somebody who is in training under the veterinarian?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Johnson, will you respond, madam?

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

248  
May 29, 2013

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Yes. The answer to the question, Madam Speaker, is yes. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative, you still have the Floor, sir.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you for the clarification.

Through you, Madam Speaker, in the scenario that our good Representative Miner brought out, that in the event it is not "an emergency in the form of an attack or life threatening" but the animal is in a lot of misery, in a lot of pain and it so happens, unfortunately, a licensed veterinarian is not available at that particular hour, at that particular time.

Through this bill, if somebody were to go ahead and do what is the humane thing to do, would it be acceptable or would they be considered committing some form of a crime?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

249  
May 29, 2013

Through you, Madam Speaker, the evidence would have to demonstrate that there was some sort of severe suffering that had to be addressed. Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative, you still have the Floor, sir.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I'm glad you mentioned that, because those scenarios could happen where in the best judgment of the owner of the dog and the cat, that the animal is in misery and necessary action needs to be taken and unfortunately distance-wise or availability-wise, a licensed veterinarian may not be available.

Through you, Madam Speaker, if such a thing were to happen, what would be the requirement of the owner so that he or she is not in any violation, but did, in their judgment the right thing to do to ease the suffering of their pet? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, a description of the incident as it became necessary in accordance with the

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

250  
May 29, 2013

owner's own vision as to what was necessary for that owner to do to make sure that the animal is not suffering and somehow demonstrate that to the authorities.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you, Madam Speaker, if the documentation is done by the owner as you correctly said, we need to do that and I want to thank the Chairwoman for her answer, when the documentation is done, who would be the authority who would then judge whether that information is adequate or a violation had occurred?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

The initial determination would certainly be made by the perhaps whoever is in charge of disposing of the animal.

So if there is a police officer in charge of that, it depends on where these things occur. Of

course, we have a state that has a variety of different types of authorities, but if it's very far out in the country, you know, there may be a police officer that comes to the aid of the person, in which case, in fact, if the police officer is there and demonstrates, feels that there's a need to euthanize the animal, then there wouldn't be a case at all.

But if in fact, the euthanization is done by the owner and then the owner brings the animal perhaps to the veterinarian for disposal purposes, then in that circumstance the veterinarian would make a determination as to whether or not the animal was euthanized properly, whether or not in his opinion, based on the medical condition of the animal, that the animal was in severe pain and had to be euthanized immediately without have the veterinarian involved in that process.

So there are a number of possibilities. If in fact there's a feeling by the veterinarian that abuse occurred, then the veterinarian would make a report to the police. The police would make a decision as to whether or not that should be turned over to the prosecutor in the district in which the incident occurred. Through you, Madam Speaker.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

252  
May 29, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I am glad that we have that option where we're looking at various scenarios. But this particular scenario, which was not very clearly addressed in the Amendment, but we've had an opportunity to talk about it here and discuss that, so that in the event such a thing were to happen, there is a recourse as far as the owner is concerned and the poor animal who obviously, the whole intent here is the dog or the cat not suffer, is not made to do so just because the licensed veterinarian is not available at that particular time.

Through you, Madam Speaker, if there is a dispute between the owner for what he or she did and the opinion of the authorities, whether it be the police or it be the veterinarian who kind of disagrees with the reason for having done what the owner did, in that situation, obviously when there's a disagreement.

Through you, Madam Speaker, what would be the recourse as far as the owner is concerned, or is it a case that is closed? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

253  
May 29, 2013

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, could the good Representative please describe what he means by a disagreement?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Through you, Madam Speaker, if the owner goes about euthanizing the dog or the cat because in his or her opinion he felt or she felt that the animal was in a lot of agony, was in a lot of pain and a licensed veterinarian was not available. An attempt had been made to get one, it could not happen given the fact it is a long holiday, it is a weekend, or whatever the hour of the day, if somebody was not available, if that is documented and then the owner goes about doing what he feels is right as far as the animal is concerned.

Would then the authority say that what the owner did was inappropriate. Only if the authorities say that. Obviously if the authorities agree, there's no concern at all.

But if the authorities feel that what the owner did was inadequate because enough suffering was not demonstrated, enough attempt was not made to reach a veterinarian and therefore they disagree.

In those scenarios, would it be possible that there is a higher court or some other form of appeal?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

The, well, there are a number of things. The veterinarian in all likelihood would make a report to the police and the police would use that process.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker, it's good to see you there.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you. Good to see you, too, sir.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, if there's a disagreement, that is where the conflict comes in.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

255  
May 29, 2013

Obviously if the police and the veterinarian and the owner are all in agreement, there is no, there's no situation at all.

But if the police feels and the veterinarian feels opposite to what the owner did in his or her best judgment, can then, is there a source where something could be appealed, or do we have to depend on a) what the police or the veterinarian decide. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the good Representative what other authority he is referring to?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, if you will be kind enough to have that question asked again, I could not understand that. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

256  
May 29, 2013

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm having a difficult time understanding what other authority the good Representative is referring to?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Srinivasan, could you rephrase your question, please, sir?

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, both the Chair and I are on the same page. I also do not know if there would be another authority and that is my question.

If there is a disagreement between the owner and the police as to why this particular act happened, then do we take it anywhere else or is the case closed and then the fines are levied? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the police don't fine the person. They give a ticket. What would happen is, there is an opportunity in all circumstances for due process, so there would be a chance for the person with a violation that has up to a year in prison to be before a court, the Superior Court, and they would

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

257  
May 29, 2013

have a hearing before a judge. Through you, Mr.  
Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr.  
Speaker, and that exactly what I was hoping to hear,  
that when this ticket is issued, that there would be a  
due process.

I'm sorry if I didn't convey that question very  
easily the first time around. We could have saved  
ourselves going back and forth.

But you feel more comfortable that in the event  
this were to happen, be it early hours of the morning  
or over a long weekend and then a ticket is issued,  
that ticket can then be taken to a court of law and  
then the appropriate action taken.

And I want to thank the Chair for her answer on  
this question, which was disturbing me, but I'm glad  
that we are able to say there is another recourse,  
which is what I was looking for.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, my final question is,  
the fine. Line 16 talks about not more than \$1,000 or  
not imprisoned for more than one year.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, who makes the determination because that's not a small amount? That's not a small time as time as the time factor is concerned. It's pretty hefty and through you, Mr. Speaker, who makes that determination?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, well, if it gets that far then the judge in the Superior Court.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, what is issued is a ticket as far as a violation and then that ticket would not qualify the amount factor like you would think when you got a traffic ticket or something like that.

In this ticket, all that would be given would be a violation occurred? Through you, Mr. Speaker, and later on is when the fine would be levied on the person?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

259  
May 29, 2013

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the police officer would make a charge. Then the defendant would go to the court, because it would have a scheduled court date, and make a decision as to whether or not they wanted to meet with the prosecutor. At that point in time, the prosecutor would discuss the file with the defendant and then from there a decision would be made on how to proceed.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

So through you, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, when the police officer issues a ticket, is this ticket different than in some other violations it is not an amount that is specified a), and that if the person is guilty or feels he or she did something inappropriate, but did it unfortunately, could pay the fine through the mail?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

260  
May 29, 2013

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the good gentleman to please describe what he means by unfortunate?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the owner of the dog or the cat goes about doing his euthanization under the set of circumstances, which he thought or she thought was appropriate, but not considered appropriate a) by the police officer or by the veterinarian and in that case the ticket is issued. That is how I understand the ticket would be issued because he or she is in violation.

And if the owner agrees to that violation right at that particular point in time, would the fine be levied there and could be paid by mail or such an opportunity doesn't arise and the person will have to go to the appropriate court to get the fine and pay it off there?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

261  
May 29, 2013

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

In order for the court to convict the person and require the fine, they have to demonstrate that the person had criminal intent. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Chair for her answers, and as I said earlier on, there were certain concerns that I had in the general scheme, but this is an Amendment. This is a bill that I stand in strong support of so that we do the right things, the right way, for our animals who are in pain.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Aman of the 14th District.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the course of the discussion there's been a couple of statements made by the proponent of the bill that I would like to have clarified.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

262  
May 29, 2013

I think the goal of everyone is to reduce any unnecessary suffering and death of a cat and a dog, something that all of us agree on.

What I'm looking at, if I heard the legislative intent from the proponent, the statement was made and I'm going to paraphrase that someone under the supervision of a licensed veterinarian could produce the euthanasia, and I just would like to make sure that I heard that correctly.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

That is correct. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

I'm looking at Lines 4 and 5 of the bill and it starts off by a comma, such euthanasia shall be performed in a humane manner by a licensed veterinarian, comma. I don't see anything in that language in that particular section that gives the flexibility to be under the supervision of and so I'm wondering where in the bill that language is presented

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

263  
May 29, 2013

or if it's in some other part of the statute because unlike most of our legislation, there is very little gray area, at least in my mind, when it says by a veterinarian. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there, this proposed legislation what it does is, it excludes certain groups and they are noted in Line 13, the Connecticut General Statutes at 20-197 and 22-332b. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

So in those sections, the 21-97 et cetera, there is something that says that when it says by a licensed veterinarian it can be someone working for the veterinarian?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

That's correct. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

264  
May 29, 2013

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Thank you. The other question I had was in the enforcement section. The reference was made several times to a ticket. Wouldn't the person actually be arrested for this? It's not an offense that would be a ticket, and especially if it's going up to Superior Court.

I think I may have just a problem with the terminology, but I associate a ticket with some sort of minor infraction, not something that is a year in jail.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, those procedures are more of the weeds of the process than this bill addresses. I'm not sure that this is a point that we really need to really thoroughly explore at this point in time. That's more of a procedural issue for another committee.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

265  
May 29, 2013

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Yes. Maybe the Judiciary Committee should have looked at this as how it should be established because it seems that while I hate to see any animal suffer, actually arresting someone seems to be a little bit of over action and not doing it.

I am glad that the legislative intent at least is that someone under the supervision as someone who has had farm animals that had to be euthanized, the veterinarian has been there, but normally it was a fairly simple procedure done by one of his assistants that actually does it probably more often and more humanely than the veterinarian himself could do.

So I do support the concept of the bill. I do have a little bit of trouble the way it was written when you're talking about life threatening and not describing it. We don't give a real definition of time of death. I have a feeling it's not going to be enforced very often except in some very severe cases, which I believe could have been handled under our animal abuse statutes and this wouldn't have been necessary.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

266  
May 29, 2013

But I am willing to listen to the rest of the debate before voting. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Alberts of the 50th.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support of the Amendment that's before us. I think that the goal that we're trying to achieve is very laudable.

I did have a question on some of the language in the Amendment, and I just wanted to make sure that my understanding was the same as the proponent's, so through you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question or two.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you. Looking in Section 1 at lines 5 through 10, it looked like the intent here was to provide a carve out where there would be an ability of someone to act in the event of a dog or a cat was injuring another animal.

Is my reading correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

267  
May 29, 2013

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that's correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'm presuming the intent was, in situations where perhaps there was a dog attacking another dog or a cat attacking another cat. Is that not correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, any number of variations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'm going to bring up one of those variations. I have never seen, well, I shouldn't say never, I haven't recently seen a cat attacking a cat, but I have seen cats attacking chipmunks and if I look at the definition here that we have in Line 7, it makes reference to a cat or a dog attacking a person or another animal under

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

268  
May 29, 2013

circumstances where a reasonable person would consider such attack life threatening to a person or another animal.

So my reading would be that under the circumstance where a cat was attacking a chipmunk on a private property, not a farm, that there would be the ability to take advantage of this carve out.

I bring this to the proponent's attention, not because I think this bill is a bad bill, I just have looked at this and I can't help but see it jump out at me that we have inadvertently created a situation, which is problematic.

So I hope that as this bill moves forward that we can somehow make some changes to it to get it back on the track that everyone can fully support it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Candelora of the 86th District, sir, you have the Floor.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of questions for legislative intent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

269  
May 29, 2013

Please proceed.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I read the provision in the first section, we are dealing with the euthanization of animals in a humane way, and as I envision that, it would be putting down a cat or a dog to end their life, whether it be for because they're very sick or they're coming to the end of their life.

We do have provisions under existing statutes that deal with the ability for someone to kill a dog if the dog is biting them on their property, so my question is, under those statutes, they still remain in full force and effect and this bill doesn't affect those provisions, that this is just dealing with the euthanization of an animal?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I thank the good Representative for his question and the answer is in the affirmative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Candelora.

pat/gbr .  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

270  
May 29, 2013

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And then, where we have the exceptions in Lines 10 through 13, we have a reference here where law enforcement officers could euthanize a dog or a cat, and at first when I read that, I thought that a more appropriate word to use would be that an officer would be able to kill a dog or a cat. They would be exempted, because I was thinking the word kill is more appropriate because a police officer wouldn't necessarily be euthanizing an animal.

But as I read the first part of the bill, is the reason why we're using that word euthanize because the entire bill is only contemplating the scenarios of euthanization versus killing?

I'm just wondering why we used that term as opposed to killing? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the idea is to draw that kind of distinction so the analysis is correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

271  
May 29, 2013

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the answers to my questions. I think it is helpful in this context, so I appreciate those answers. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Camillo of the 151st, sir, you have the Floor.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for allowing me to speak for a second time. I sat down before and I wanted to mention that there were two people that really helped with this bill. Representative Urban did a great job and when I was sick, Representative Scribner really did a terrific job of shepherding this bill through and keeping me abreast of what was going on when I wasn't here and without them the bill wouldn't have gotten done, so I want to thank them.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, sir. Representative Ziobron of the 34th District, ma'am, you have the Floor.

REP. ZIOBRON (34th):

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

272  
May 29, 2013

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have a couple of questions to the proponent of the Amendment, please, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir, ma'am, excuse me.

REP. ZIOBRON (34th):

Thank you, sir. I appreciate that. As a Member of the Public Health Committee I recall these public hearings and they are quite animated, for lack of a better term. A lot of questions were asked.

So, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent, is the carve out for the Human Society within this Amendment?

Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the existing statutory framework for these organizations that were not doing anything but euthanizing animals, whether they are research or the Humane Society, those laws have not been touched by this.

The only thing that this law does is make it so that a pet owner, it's a very narrowly tailored law, a

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

273  
May 29, 2013

pet owner cannot be allowed to kill an animal and a licensed veterinarian should be the one to euthanize the animal and that we wouldn't want to have anything stop someone from being in a situation where they're being attacked or their pet, other pet is being attacked by a domestic animal and in those circumstances, either a police officer or the owner of the pet can actually be considered to be euthanizing the pet if that pet is creating a life threatening or physical injuring type of situation.

In all other circumstances that are not emergent, the owner is required under this law to bring that animal to a veterinarian for euthanization purposes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the reason I ask that question is because during the public hearing for this proposal, one of the reasons why I hesitated in support of it is because in my district we have a lot of people who for one reason or another can't afford to bring their dying animal to a vet, and I have heard many stories of family members agonizing over their

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

274  
May 29, 2013

decision to put the animal down, but not by a veterinarian.

So I'm looking at Line 19 of the Amendment and it talks about such a cat or dog with a life threatening injury. Can a life threatening illness also be used in defense of prosecution? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

That would be depending on the facts of the situation. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'm going to have to dig a little deeper on that, then.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, can you give me some examples of a life threatening illness that would allow a distraught family in making that decision for their beloved family pet? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time the vision here is to make sure that a person who has a pet that has a life threatening illness seeks the assistance of a veterinarian.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the good Representative for the answer to that question, and that really is the crux of my dilemma as a Representative for people in my district because we have many people who simply cannot afford to go to a veterinarian.

And I've heard some of their stories and it is, you know, certainly not a position I would ever want to see somebody in who has a pet who is like a member of their family, suffering from a life threatening illness and they simply do not have the money to bring them to a vet to end their life in a way that is going to stop the pain that their beloved pet is in, which is why during the public hearing when the first amendment was drawn on this bill, we talked about the Humane Society, and I think if I recall, the Humane

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

276  
May 29, 2013

Society I think at the time had said that they even put pets down at no cost.

So, I'm glad to hear that this Amendment is very, very narrowly defined. It does not stop the ability of the Humane Society from offering that service to people in need, because I think, especially in this economy, we're seeing more and more families who are really struggling with a pet that they love so much, having not necessarily a life threatening injury, but a life threatening disease and they want to put their pet out of suffering.

I thank the good gentle lady for her answers to my questions, and I'll continue to listen to the debate on the bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Adinolfi of the 103rd District, sir, you have the Floor.

REP. ADINOLFI (103rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question through you to the proponent of the bill, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ADINOLFI (103rd):

My question is, basically I've got to lead into it. I had an incident when an individual was walking a dog and, with a leash and the dog was hit by a car and run over by a neighbor that lived up the street.

So naturally, I knew the neighbor didn't do it intentionally and so I wouldn't call the police, but it was obvious that that dog would never make it. I mean, the back end of him was almost completely off, but it was still breathing and the dog was euthanized on the spot. The police were never involved and the dog was buried on the property.

Now, would this bill prevent something like that from happening, especially where the individual that did the euthanization is not a professional?. They did in good faith what they thought was the right thing to do.

And under this bill, this individual, if somebody later on, or the police did show up and said, oh, no, that dog would have made it or had a chance, and this individual acted in good faith, why should they have to go out and spend hundreds of dollars or in these days thousands of dollars for an attorney to get off the hook?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

278  
May 29, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm so sorry to hear of the good Representative's terrible misfortune. I think that the facts of the case are what will be the determining factor in terms of whether or not there is an issue here.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Adinolfi.

REP. ADINOLFI (103rd):

I appreciate the answer, but my concern is, if the incident that the police did come and didn't agree with me, it would cost me many, many, many dollars in expenses to have myself cleared. Through you, Mr. Speaker, and is there somewhere in the future we can correct something like this in here? Maybe in the Senate and then send it back down? I don't know, but that is a concern of mine.

And through you, Mr. Speaker, I had one more question and I think it affects all of us in this room.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, my question is, many of us go out knocking on doors and there's been two incidents where once I wound up in the emergency room because I was attacked by a dog and would I be, how do I recognize whether that attack is life threatening or not, and would have I been, not that I would carry a gun going door to door, but would have I been in my rights or say it was another individual and not me, to kill that dog if he jumped on me? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is also a very unfortunate circumstance that I'm very sorry to hear that you had to endure. I mean, that's terrible.

So in terms of the life threatening, these are factually based circumstances that must be addressed by the people in the situation.

In this circumstance sometimes you know, people have a situation where they are in a life threatening situation and other times it's a terrible and unfortunate circumstance to have a dog bite, but it's

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

280  
May 29, 2013

not life threatening. So these are the things that have to be addressed by the facts of the situation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Adinolfi.

REP. ADINOLFI (103rd):

Thank you for the answer and I'd just like to pass a comment. The one incident was not that bad. The dog actually bit me and the person I was visiting while we were shaking hands, and we both had to go, so we just had bites.

But there was one incident who was knocked down completely by a big German Shepherd and had a lot of problems after that, and I think that's something should address these situations, because persons like myself, we're not professionals when it comes to determining whether the dog be it hit by a car or something like that, that it is life threatening or not and we do what we think is right.

I do support this bill. I like the idea of it, but I think it doesn't go far enough to protect the people that really do something which might be considered wrong innocently and having to go through

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

281  
May 29, 2013

the expenses of getting themselves cleared I think is too much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Buck-Taylor of the 67th, you have the Floor, ma'am.

REP. BUCK-TAYLOR (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, some questions to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, ma'am.

REP. BUCK-TAYLOR (67th):

If I may, is the purpose behind this bill to prevent people from maliciously killing animals? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Buck-Taylor.

REP. BUCK-TAYLOR (67th):

And if I may, Connecticut General Statutes 53-247 states under subsection b, any person who maliciously

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

282  
May 29, 2013

and intentionally maims, mutilates, tortures, wounds or kills an animal shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years or both.

So my question to the proponent, is her purpose covered under this section of the Cruelty to Animals Statute? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, certainly that would, this does not do anything to impact that particular part of the statute. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Buck-Taylor.

REP. BUCK-TAYLOR (67th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker to the proponent of the bill, if someone does maliciously and intentionally kill their animal, are they subject now to two penalties? One, which is up to \$1,000 and one year in prison under the proposed bill and also, not more than \$5,000 nor imprisoned more than five years? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

283  
May 29, 2013

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that would depend on the facts of the case.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Buck-Taylor.

REP. BUCK-TAYLOR (67th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, if the facts of the case were that someone maliciously and intentionally killed the animal, would they then be subject to two penalties for committing that behavior?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that there would have to be more facts than just the statement of what the statute says. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Buck-Taylor.

REP. BUCK-TAYLOR (67th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, one of the other things that I was trying to find out as I was reviewing this bill is, what is the definition of euthanize? And the reason I'm asking that is that if you have an elderly

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

284  
May 29, 2013

cat who is reaching the end of its life and you let it just expire, is that euthanizing the cat because you didn't bring it to the veterinary to have them take care of that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, you wouldn't necessarily have to bring a cat to the vet or any other animal to the vet if they die peacefully in their sleep.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Buck-Taylor.

REP. BUCK-TAYLOR (67th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, is there a definition to euthanize that we can use when analyzing this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there is no definition of euthanization.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

285  
May 29, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Buck-Taylor.

REP. BUCK-TAYLOR (67th):

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the intent behind this bill. I don't think anybody in this room wants to see any animals that are maliciously and intentionally tortured or killed. I am a little bit concerned about the a) expanse of this bill in that I do not have a definition of euthanize.

I also have a concern in that it appears that we have another statute that already defines the behavior that we have here and it has a conflicting penalty.

So I will continue to listen to the debate, Mr. Speaker, but those are my concerns. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Larry Miller of the 122nd District, sir, you have the Floor.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, German Shepherds are noted for having bad back legs and they get to the point where sometimes you have to push them to get them to move or go up a stair. Would that be, would that qualify the homeowner to think that maybe it's time to euthanize that dog?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

That would be a decision between the resident, the homeowner and the veterinarian.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

And through you, Mr. Speaker, in other words if the dog is so bad you'd have to take him to a veterinarian to find out if you're permitted to have him euthanized?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

287  
May 29, 2013

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I understand the good Representative's question. Could he please rephrase it?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

Okay. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Is it proper to bring a dog that you think should be euthanized to a veterinarian to see if it's proper to put him to sleep?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

And through you, Mr. Speaker, what's the cost between the veterinarian euthanizing an animal and the Humane Society? Do you know that?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

288  
May 29, 2013

I'm sorry. Could the good Representative please speak a little louder?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I just want to know what the costs are for a veterinarian to euthanize an animal and the Humane Society, if you know those numbers?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I know the veterinarians have various charges, so I wouldn't be able to speak to those costs. And it's my understanding the Humane Society does provide some service to people who can't afford it and look for donations in other places.

So when people can't afford the euthanization of an animal, they can go to the Humane Society and I thank the gentleman for his question.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank the lady for her answers.

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

289  
May 29, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds.

All those in favor please signify by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

All those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?  
Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Will the Members please take your seats. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by Roll Call. Members to the Chamber, please.

The House of Representatives is voting by Roll Call. Members to the Chamber, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

pat/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

290  
May 29, 2013

Have all Members voted? Have all Members voted?  
Will the Members please check the board to see if  
their vote is properly cast.

If all Members have voted, the machine will be  
locked and the Clerk will take a tally. Will the  
Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Substitute House Bill 6591 as  
amended by House "A".

Total Number Voting	144
Necessary for Passage	73
Those voting Yea	131
Those voting Nay	13
Those absent and not voting	6

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The bill as amended is passed.

Are there any announcements or introductions?  
Are there any announcements or introductions?

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 645.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. On Page 35, Calendar Number  
645, Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee  
on Appropriations, Substitute Senate Bill Number 387

AN ACT INCREASING THE MINIMUM FAIR WAGE.

**H - 1180**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2013**

**VETO  
SESSION**

**VOL.56  
PART 31  
10451 - 10795**

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Will the House please come back to order. Will the Clerk please call Calendar number 364.

THE CLERK:

Calendar number 364 on page 43 (inaudible) action, favorable report of the joint standing Committee on Judiciary, substitute House Bill 6591, AN ACT REQUIRING EUTHANASIA OF ANY CAT OR DOG TO BE PERFORMED BY A LICENSED VETERINARIAN.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Susan Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Good evening, Madam.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

I move the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in conformance with the Senate Amendment LCO number 8869.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The question before the -- no -- the question before the Chamber is acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request that we call LCO number 8869 and I be granted leave of the Chair to summarize.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The question before the -- will the Clerk please call LCO 8869 which has been previously designated Senate A.

THE CLERK:

Senate A, LCO 8869 introduced by Senator Gerratana et al.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The Gentlewoman seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there objection? Seeing none, you may proceed with summarization, Madam.

REP. JOHNSON (49th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple change that was overlooked in the original bill and that's why it's back here in the Chamber. And all it does is it adds some government organizations and private organizations that have been providing these services for euthanization and they should be excluded from the bill. I move adoption.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The question before the Chamber is adoption of Senate Amendment A. Will you remark? Representative Camillo of the 151st.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd also like to rise and thank the gentle Chairlady for bringing this out and to agree with her that it is only to expand the carve outs to include research facilities like the UCONN Health Center and pharmaceutical companies like Pfizer. And as we all know it passed out of here overwhelming and it was put on Consent in the Senate. And I urge adoption. Thank you.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, Sir. Would you care to remark further on Senate Amendment A? Representative Rebimbas of the 70th District.

REP. REBIMBAS (70th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise on the Senate amendment that's before us here today. And certainly the carve out is certainly appropriate. The last thing we want to do is impact those facilities that were already carrying this on. So I do thank the Senate for their change and I do support the bill that's before us.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, Madam. Would you care to remark further on Senate Amendment A? Representative Srinivasan of the 31st.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Good evening, Sir.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

I too rise in strong support of this amendment. This carve out is essential and I'm glad we are following what the Senate has done as -- when it's sent back to us and I urge adopt -- that the -- both sides of the aisle adopt this as well. Through you -- thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, Sir. Would you care to remark further on Senate Amendment A? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of Senate Amendment A please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The

amendment is adopted. Would you care to remark further on the bill as amended? Would you care to remark further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

Members please return to the Chamber immediately.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Will the members please check the board to make sure your vote is properly cast. If all the members have voted the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

In concurrence with the Senate, substitute House Bill 6591 as amended by Senate A and House A.

Total Number Voting	144
Necessary for Adoption	73
Those voting aye	131
Those voting nay	13
Absent and not voting	6

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The bill as amended -- as adopted. I'm sorry.  
The bill is passed. The bill as amended is passed in  
concurrence with the Senate. Will the Clerk please  
call Calendar 655.

THE CLERK:

Calendar number 655 on page 29, favorable report  
of the joint standing Committee on Public Safety and  
Security, substitute Senate Bill 709, AN ACT  
CONCERNING THE SILVER ALERT SYSTEM AND MAINTAINING THE  
PRIVACY OF MISSING PERSONS' MEDICAL INFORMATION.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Will the Clerk -- we'll take a moment. We'll  
take a moment. The Clerk -- Mr. Clerk, if you could  
clear the board. We were calling Calendar 655. I  
believe you had 665 on originally. So let me go  
through this again if I could from the beginning. Mr.  
Clerk, would you call Calendar number 655

THE CLERK:

My mistake, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. Favorable  
report of the joint standing Committee on Education,  
substitute Senate Bill 1137, AN ACT CONCERNING THE  
DEFINITION OF SCHOOL-BASED HEALTH CENTER.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

**S - 667**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2013**

**VOL. 56  
PART 16  
4803 - 5160**

cah/gbr  
SENATE

352  
June 4, 2013

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, before moving to a -- a vote on our Consent Calendar, have one additional item to mark as go which we believe will need to be amended and -- and then voted upon. Madam President, that's Calendar Page 18, Calendar 682, Substitute House -- Substitute for House Bill 6591.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

Mr. Clerk.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Call the -- the Clerk would call that item. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 18, Calendar 682, Substitute for House Bill Number 6591, AN ACT REQUIRING THE EUTHANIZATION OF ANY CAT OR DOG TO BE PERFORMED BY A LICENSED VETERINARIAN, Favorable Report of the Committee on Public Health.

THE CHAIR:

Sorry, Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Good morning, Madam President.

Madam President, I move accept of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the House.

cah/gbr  
SENATE

353  
June 4, 2013

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on acceptance and passage in concurrence.

Will you -- will you remark, Ma'am?

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Thank you, Madam President, I will.

This bill requires that the euthanization of dogs or cats be performed only by licensed veterinarians in a humane manner.

Madam President, I have an amendment. If the Clerk will please call LCO Number 8869.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk is not in possession of the amendment. The Senate will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you call the amendment now please.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 8869, Senate "A", offered by Senators Gerratana, Bye, et al.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Thank you, Madam President.

cah/gbr  
SENATE

354  
June 4, 2013

I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on adoption.

Will you remark, Ma'am?

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Yes, Madam President.

This amendment is necessary. There are some exceptions to the euthanasia by a licensed veterinarian and one is included here on line 8, number 4, the euthanization of any animal in a facility subject to regulation by the United States Department of Health and Human Services National Institutes of Health Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare. That clarification needed to be added to the underlying bill.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Will you remark?

Then I'll try your minds. All in favor of Senate "A" please say aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed?

Amendment passes.

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

cah/gbr  
SENATE

355  
June 4, 2013

Madam President, seeing no objection, would this item please be placed on our Consent Calendar?

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

Senator Looney..

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, with that item being moved to the Consent Calendar, Madam President, there is an -- an item on the foot of the Calendar to be removed and, Madam President, on -- on the foot of the Calendar, Calendar Page 42, Calendar 648, House Bill 6660, would move to remove that item from the foot and to mark it passed retaining its place on the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, at this point if the Clerk would list the items on the second Consent Calendar so that we might proceed to a vote on that Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5607; House Bill 6509; House Bill 5027. On Page 4, Calendar 459, House Bill 6622; on Page 7, Calendar 536, Senate Bill 1163.

HB6591

Page 14, Calendar 651, House Bill 6565. On Page 15, Calendar 660, House Bill 6290. Page 17, Calendar 678, House Bill 6671. Also Calendar 686, House Bill 6528.

cah/gbr  
SENATE

356  
June 4, 2013

On Page 19, Calendar 689, House Bill 6677 and on Page 24, Calendar 484, Senate Bill Number 983.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call vote on the second Consent Calendar. The machine is open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call on Senate -- on Consent Calendar Number 2 has been 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 please call the tally.

THE CLERK:

On Consent Calendar Number 2.

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

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I would move for immediate transmittal to the House of Representatives of any items voted on the second Consent Calendar needing additional action by the House.

THE CHAIR:

cah/gbr  
SENATE

357  
June 4, 2013

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

And also if there are any other items that were voted individually that may need additional action by the House.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Good, thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, that will conclude -- conclude our business for this evening or this morning at this point. Before adjournment I would yield the floor to any members for announcements or points of personal privilege.

THE CHAIR:

Any announcements or personal privilege?

Seeing none, Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Madam President, for a -- a Journal notation. Senator Coleman was -- was absent and missed votes today due to -- due to illness.

THE CHAIR:

So noted, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, one other item. On the -- the -- the items on the foot of the Calendar beginning on Calendar Page 27, beginning with Calendar 59, on Calendar Page 27 at the beginning of the foot and

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC  
HEALTH  
PART 12  
3694-4017**

**2013**

officials to make. There are many ways for someone to -- to die with dignity, but it is not by taking one's own life.

I've submitted written testimony, and I'm very grateful for the opportunity to be here today and firmly urge you to oppose House Bill 6645.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Senator, thank you so much for coming and presenting your testimony. We appreciate that very much.

Does anyone have any questions?

If not, sir, thank you so much.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN: Thank you.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Next to testify is Representative Diana Urban.

Good morning.

REP. URBAN: It's so nice to see you, Senator. I miss you on the Children's Committee.

SENATOR GERRATANA: It's nice to see you, too, ma'am.

REP. URBAN: And it's very nice to see all the members of the committee here. I am here today to testify on House Bill 6591, which is an act requiring the euthanization of any cat or dog to be performed by a licensed veterinarian.

You do have my testimony in front of you, so I will summarize it because I know you guys have a long day ahead of you.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you, madam.

REP. URBAN: You are most welcome.

What happened was there was a dog, a five-and a-half-year-old German shepherd whose owner could no longer take care of him, and he relinquished him to a rescue organization, and the dog got what they thought was a perfect home, a young woman where he'd be the only animal. And within 48 hours the dog was dead. And it turned out that someone shot him in the head, either the boyfriend or the girlfriend, and they were never able to ascertain exactly what happened because the body never showed up. The boyfriend blamed the girlfriend; the girlfriend blamed the boyfriend; one of them had a criminal record.

Anyway, to make a long story endless, Representative Camillo took this issue to heart and he has worked diligently on trying to get the law clarified that there would never be the opportunity for you to take your dog out in the backyard and shoot it; that if there is a problem and that that dog was either aggressive or whatever, that that would always be taken care by a veterinarian with humane euthanization. They did say that this dog bit someone, but there was no hospital record. There was no indication that the dog bit anyone and he had never bitten anyone in five and a half years so this bill is an answer to that situation.

Unfortunately, there was some meddling with the language of the bill, but I brought that to the attention of the chairs, and I really appreciate the fact that you were -- very quickly responded to that, and there is the real language of this bill which is from an amendment from last session, whereas time ran

out and we couldn't actually get the bill done, but that language is there.

And, Madam Chair, this is really Representative Camillo's bill and he has testimony that you will have thereto. He is recovering from surgery and cancer and is very weak. And I said that I would be glad to say that how deeply he cares about getting this bill done. And I won't read you his testimony, again, because of time constraints, but just know that we're all sending our best wishes to him and that, you know, that you are listening attentively to what is taking place here. And I'm available for any questions.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you, madam. Certainly, we all wish Representative Camillo a speedy, speedy recovery and great success as he goes through his trials.

I just wanted to ask you for the language that you discussed with me, because, unfortunately, I don't believe I have it in hand. So if you will, you can e-mail it to myself, Representative Johnson and Senator Welch and Representative Srinivasan, if you would please do that.

REP. URBAN: I believe it's attached to the testimony. It's just a question of scrolling down. And that is we, also --

SENATOR GERRATANA: Okay. Oh, I guess -- here it is. Okay, sorry.

REP. URBAN: I'm glad you said that because I cite LCO 5325 from 2012. It's actually LCO 5594, that was the fiscal, and there is no fiscal on it, but 5594 was the actual amendment.

SENATOR GERRATANA: And I made note of that. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions?

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

And thank you, Representative, for your testimony. My question on the bill is, there's an exemption for the Connecticut Humane Society in this bill; is that correct?

REP. URBAN: In the language that is in front of you there is. In the amendment that we initially did last -- in 2012, that language was not included.

REP. MILLER: But -- so that will be -- will -- so it will be in the bill that there will be an exemption for them then?

REP. URBAN: Can I assume that you're asking me about the meddling part of this?

SENATOR GERRATANA: Well, madam, before we proceed there, I'm going to look at the recommendation you made, LCO 5594 from 2012, and is it -- and I hope the committee's understanding that the substitute language for this bill is section 1 new, it says, "language for House Bill 6591." Is that the language that you would like to substitute for the underlying bill?

REP. URBAN: Yes, Madam Chair.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Okay. Just so long as we are all on the page. Thank you -- same page, I should say.

REP. URBAN: And to respond to Representative Miller's question, what had happened, Representative Miller, was this was Representative Camillo's bill and Legislators for Animal Advocacy was supporting the bill, but, as you know, things get rushed around here, so Representative Camillo was following the bill, not me, and he was very sick, he had surgery at Sloan-Kettering and what happened was language was given to LCO through some conduit that I can talk to you about later, and the language was basically change to solidify Connecticut Humane's ability not to use a veterinarian when they euthanize animals. And as you know, I have always been a proponent of euthanizing any animal with a veterinarian, unless it's a farm animal because I grew up on a farm, and I know when you're in the north 40 and a cow has broken its leg or run through a barbed wire fence that oftentimes the farmer has to dispense humanely, really, because it's almost always, in my experience, done with a gun, and you just have to have that exemption. That's the only exemption that we're supporting.

REP. MILLER: Thank you for that clarification and thank you for your testimony.

And thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you, Representative.

Representative Conroy -- oh, was the question -  
- okay.

I don't believe there are any more questions.  
I think we are clear now --

REP. URBAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC  
HEALTH  
PART 14  
4317-4577**

**2013**

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you. Thank you for your testimony. Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you. Any additional questions? Thank you so much. Dr. Goodkind. Gordon Willard on House Bill 6591, followed by Dr. Chris Gargonelli and then Nancy Parker. Welcome. Please state your name for the record.

GORDON WILLARD: Hi. My name is Gordon Willard. I'm the Executive Director at the Connecticut Humane Society. I've been at the Humane Society for about three years and I have been in animal welfare for over 30 years.

I'm here today to ask the Committee, to testify for HB 6591. Previous drafts of the bill had included a penalty provision. CHS urges the Committee to add a penalty to this bill, where any person who uses gunshot and causes an animal to suffer be charged with a felony crime. Without a penalty, this bill will be ineffective.

The Buddy Bill is named after a dog whose name was Buddy and he was one of my pets. He was surrendered to the Connecticut Humane Society at the Westport Shelter. Working with a rescue partner organization Buddy was adopted and then shot to death 40 hours after his adoption.

There was no provocation and Buddy was confined. He posed no risk.

I'm not only here to speak for Buddy but for all animals who suffer from such inhumane and callous treatment. The case was never prosecuted. While everyone was debating about

who owned Buddy, my question is, did it really matter?

Our laws are created to protect all creatures regardless of ownership. Suffering is not diminished by ownership.

The Newington Branch of the Connecticut Humane Society has a full-time veterinarian who oversees all practices, including those performed by veterinary technicians and trained staff.

While Newington has the largest veterinary staff, our other two shelters have veterinary technicians and limited veterinary coverage, but our shelters remain open seven days a week and are routinely presented dire circumstances where pets need relief.

CHS does not take this statutory responsibility lightly. In order to maintain the highest standards to performance and to maintain the most caring humane practices for those animals in need, our most senior staff, experienced staff and veterinary technician staff are selected, trained, evaluated before authorized to perform euthanasia.

The responsibility associated with the veterinarians whose DAA license is used, commands the highest standards to performance, the same as any practice in the state.

The role of the Connecticut Humane Society in the eyes of the public, for the last 132 years, this to be the last refuge for citizens with animal issues.

Time and time again we need to relieve suffering and deal with animals in dire

circumstances continues to be presented to all of our shelters and adoption centers.

Those shelters must retain the statutory exemption established in 1981 to be able to provide humane euthanasia. Nothing in 2013 has changed since enacting the law in 1981.

CHS has identified the Buddy Law as a top priority in 2013. We hope you will support HB 6591 as presented with the addition of the penalty provision. Thank you.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you for your testimony and waiting so long. Are there any questions? Yes, Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for your testimony. I'm looking at the bill now and can you direct me to where the penalty is in the bill, and if you can't do that, tell me how much it is, please.

GORDON WILLARD: Unfortunately, during some transmission to this Committee, the penalty was left out and that's why I'm urging the Committee for some mechanism to put a penalty in. I believe the original penalty was a year in jail and maybe \$1,000. I'm suggesting let's go a little higher. It should be a felony when someone provides that kind of brutality on an animal.

REP. ZIOBRON: Can you tell me how much it costs for somebody to euthanize their pet?

GORDON WILLARD: Where?

REP. ZIOBRON: As you're suggesting here, if somebody were to take --

GORDON WILLARD: That depends --

REP. ZIOBRON: -- their pet to a veterinarian.

GORDON WILLARD: It would depend on the practice.

REP. ZIOBRON: Can you give me a ballpark, please?

GORDON WILLARD: Well, I think it would be several hundreds of dollars, easily. At Connecticut Humane price is not an issue. If people can provide some payment that's fine, but the animal is the key component and we would do it at no charge.

REP. ZIOBRON: So would in fact you say that a regular, average person who could not afford to go to a veterinarian could go bring their animal to the Humane Society? Is that what you're suggesting?

GORDON WILLIAMS: I'm suggesting it and encouraging it because if we don't have that access we will find animals abandoned more often, which then brings animal control into the picture. The animals have to be maintained for seven days and then they have to transport them to a veterinarian to have it done.

I'm suggesting in my world, in my experience, that people who don't have a resource and the capacity to go to a standard practice, need that access and Connecticut Humane supplies that.

REP. ZIOBRON: That's really great to hear. Is that something that you advertise for people so that they understand that that option is available to them?

GORDON WILLARD: Well, we walk a fine line because we're not here to take business away from private practice, but it's on our website and we're aware, we have a full service veterinary clinic for people who cannot use typical providers, and we provide that service there as well.

And it may be something, you've seen a big change in the economy and who used to be in the middle income is no longer there, so they're seeing our services, you know. They're using our service much more often.

REP. ZIOBRON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for your testimony.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you. Yes, Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for your testimony and I'm glad you made it clear that the felony component was not in the bill and that that needs to be included, because obviously we do need to do that.

GORDON WILLARD: Yeah. The bill would be ineffective and I think would not send the right message unless the penalty was in there.

REP. SRINIVASAN: And thank you for all the work that you do at the Connecticut Humane Society. And as you said, you do not advertise obviously, for obvious reasons but is Newington the only location that you have in the state or are there other locations in the state as well?

GORDON WILLARD: We have three locations, Newington the largest in central Connecticut. We have one in Westport and we have a shelter in Waterford. Those are the two shelters.

They're busy but we're not able to keep full-time veterinary service in those shelters, so our veterinarian at Newington certainly oversees the vet techs and the staff there.

But they're open seven days. They're presented with the same kind of circumstances that we see in Newington. We just may see more of it but then again, in a community like Waterford where services may not be as accessible, they may see more of it per capita.

REP. SRINIVASAN: And my final question to you, you use the word vet tech. Are they also there in a conventional veterinarian practice, those technicians are being supervised by the veterinarian.

GORDON WILLARD: Most of the work that they do is, I would say manage and directed by our veterinary protocols. If it's anything outside those protocols we use local veterinarians or they will confer with our practicing veterinarians at the Newington shelter or at the Fox Clinic.

If it's not available, then we always refer to local veterinarians, and they have some veterinary service there. We have contracted veterinarians that come in, but it's very minimal, but they do a lot of the treatment and they do a lot of direction as well.

REP. SRINIVASAN: And my final question, for services rendered, is payment on a, is that expected or only if the person is capable of paying or is there a sliding scale that you will have?

GORDON WILLARD: We have a suggested price but at Connecticut Humane, the overriding and most important component is to provide relief to the

animal, so it's irrelevant if they provide that income. Many times people will come to us, they've already been to a veterinarian and could not pay that fee and could not get that service.

If they could not provide that income to us, remember we're a donor subsidized organization and the animal is our primary concern. We try to do, you know, as much as we can for them.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you, and thank you for all your services.

GORDON WILLARD: Thank you.

REP. SRINIVASAN: We appreciate that. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you. Representative Zoni.

REP. ZONI: Hello. Thank you, Madam Chair. Gordon, it's good to see you again.

GORDON WILLARD: Good morning.

REP. ZONI: I just wanted to say thank you for all your great work.

GORDON WILLARD: Thank you.

REP. ZONI: Other than the penalty aspect, you're okay with this bill as written?

GORDON WILLARD: Yes, as written it does include, it does refer to the statutory regulation that allows Connecticut Humane to continue to do euthanasia within our community. That needs to remain in the bill.

I see it perfectly fine. Let's get the penalty in there. Mr. Camillo wanted it in there. We all wanted it in there. I think everybody wants it in there, both to make a statement to the community and to put bad people into the penal system.

REP. ZONI: Thank you so much.

GORDON WILLARD: Thank you.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you. Thank you for your testimony this evening, this morning. Okay. Nancy Parker. Welcome.

NANCY PARKER: Good evening.

REP. JOHNSON: Actually, good morning.

NANCY PARKER: Good morning, good evening. I couldn't think of what it was. I guess I'm sort of loopy. The last time I was here this late was the last night of the Session in May, so I am here briefly.

My name is Nancy Parker. I'm from Hartford. I'm an animal rights advocate and a psychiatric social worker and I just want to, I did not submit testimony. I'm sorry. And I wanted to speak in support of House Bill Number 6591 AN ACT REQUIRING THE EUTHANISATION OF ANY CAT OR DOG BE PERFORMED BY A LICENSED VETERINARIAN.

HB6645

I also, and I'm sorry I got not in time to hear Representative Urban's testimony this morning.

I also, I know it's cost me different amounts of money to have some of my, I've had cats for many decades and I've had to have some put to sleep and it cost me different amounts of

money, depending on the medical care that went along with it to try to keep them alive.

But I also wanted to speak in favor of House Bill 6645 AN ACT CONCERNING COMPASSIONATE AID IN DYING FOR TERMINALLY ILL PATIENTS. I hope I said I'm in support of that.

I really feel that if a person wants or chooses to leave this world they have that right if other avenues have been explored and their life has just become miserable and unmanageable, and I just think to tell a terminally ill person they have to suffer beyond belief is inhumane and unfair.

So I just wanted to speak in support of those two bills.

REP. JOHNSON: Well thank you for being here and waiting and being so quick about providing your testimony. Are there any questions? Thank you so much and have a good evening.

NANCY PARKER: Thank you.

REP. JOHNSON: The next bill is Senate Bill 1128 and the first person I have who apparently may be left is Mary Consoli, followed by Michelle Lopez, then Karen Lynsted or Linster and then Mary O'Brien. Welcome and state your name for the record, please.

MARY CONSOLI: Good morning. I'm Mary Consoli. I'm President of the Danbury Nurses Union. We represent 600 registered nurses in Danbury Hospital and I'm here to speak in opposition to Raised Bill 1128 AN ACT CONCERNING INFLUENZA IMMUNIZATION FOR HEALTH CARE EMPLOYEES.

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC  
HEALTH  
PART 15  
4578-4856**

**2013**



Testimony Before the Public Health Committee  
HB 6591 An Act Requiring the Euthanization of Any Cat or Dog to be Performed by a Licensed  
Veterinarian  
March 20, 2013

Senator Gerratana, Representative Johnson, Senator Welch, Representative Srinivasan, Members of the Public Health Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to offer testimony regarding HB 6591, An Act Requiring the Euthanization of Any Cat or Dog to be Performed by a Licensed Veterinarian. We represent the Connecticut Veterinary Medical Association, which includes over 95% of Connecticut-licensed veterinarians among its members.

It has been conventional wisdom that euthanasia is a veterinary medical procedure, that the techniques required to perform it: veterinary medical assessment, behavioral assessment, drug dosage calculation, venipuncture, catheterization, cardiac function assessment and affirmation that death has occurred are all aspects of the practice of veterinary medicine under the law! CGS: Chapter 384: Section 197 makes that clear.

Further, the drugs required to perform euthanasia can only be purchased by a licensed veterinarian who informs the vendor of their state license number with renewal date and their state and federal controlled substances dispensing registration numbers. Only a licensed veterinarian is permitted to possess, use or dispose of these medications and the record keeping necessary to use them are the sole responsibility of a licensed veterinarian.

Thus, I ask you to ponder the following questions:

*How did it come to pass that only the Connecticut Humane Society is exempt?*

*Why does the exemption continue to exist?*

*Why is there no similar exemption for all organizations that perform this work?*

The CVMA has testified about the CHS exemption in the past, and we reiterate our position that it remains inappropriate and further, is unnecessary, inasmuch as the CHS employs licensed veterinarians who can oversee and delegate the task as necessary.

The CVMA believes veterinary medicine should be practiced by licensed veterinarians in this state, as it is in other states. Euthanasia is a veterinary treatment, that outside of law enforcement related emergencies, requires the judgment and skills of a veterinarian to be humanely and properly performed.

As there is no shortage of state licensed veterinarians willing to work with state humane organizations to fulfill their needs, I urge you, on behalf of the animal owning public and our animals, to eliminate any exceptions allowing lay personnel employed by humane organizations to administer euthanasia. Please restore euthanasia as a treatment properly administered by veterinarians.

The CVMA support the language submitted to the Committee today by Representatives Urban and Camillo, which was the original intention of "Buddy's Law." We have attached that language and encourage your support.

Thank you.

Eva Ceranowicz DVM, Chair, Government Relations Committee  
Chris Gargamelli DVM, President  
Arnold L. Goldman DVM, AVMA Delegate  
Connecticut Veterinary Medical Association

Language for HB 6591

"Sec. 1. (NEW) (Effective from passage) (a) Notwithstanding any provision of the general statutes, whenever any cat or dog is euthanized, such euthanization shall be performed in a humane manner by a licensed veterinarian, provided nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the euthanization of any cat or dog while such cat or dog is attacking a person or another animal under circumstances where a reasonable person would consider such attack life-threatening to a person or another animal or likely to cause serious physical injury to a person or another animal. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to apply to the euthanization of any farm animal or livestock or to the euthanization of any cat or dog by any law enforcement officer in the course of his or her duties.

(b) Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(c) It shall be a defense to prosecution under this section that such person euthanized such cat or dog with a life-threatening injury in order to prevent such cat or dog's further suffering

**Testimony for HB 6591 An Act requiring the euthanization of any cat or dog to be performed by a licensed veterinarian.**

By Karen Laski, 279 Fern St. Manchester, CT 06040

I strongly am in favor of this bill to insure that euthanasia of dogs and cats is performed with skill and care by a veterinarian. I have seen Vet techs struggle with animals and poorly handle them. Euthanasia should be performed with great skill and compassion so as not to instill fear with the animal. It should be done with competent hands and delivered with compassion.

People who are not veterinarians should not be involved in this important transition and dog and cat owners should take the time and care to make sure their animal is treated with kindness when the time comes.

I do not believe that the Ct Humane Society or farmers should be exempted from this law.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Karen Laski



Sen. Gerratana, Rep. Johnson, Sen. Slossberg, Rep. Miller, Sen. Welch, Rep. Srinivasan and other distinguished members of the Public Health Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to deliver this testimony to your committee. My name is Gordon Willard, Executive Director for the last two and half years at the Connecticut Humane Society. I am here to testify in support of the concept in HB6591 "An Act Requiring the Euthanasia of Any Cat or Dog to be performed by a Licensed Veterinarian."

Previous drafts of this bill contained a penalty provision that would provide a punishment to anyone violating the intent of the bill. The Connecticut Humane Society urges the committee to add a penalty provision to the bill where any person who violates section in this bill would be charged with a felony. Without the penalty provision, this bill would become ineffective, would not clearly instruct law enforcement and our judiciary and would not reflect Connecticut's wishes to protect animals from pain and suffering.

A coalition of interested parties labeled this proposal as "Buddy's Law" in reference to a dog adopted from our Westport Animal Care and Adoption facility that was brutally, needlessly and inhumanely killed in 2010.

Buddy was a German shepherd surrendered by his owner to the Connecticut Humane Society in Westport. Buddy was transferred to Leader of the Pack Rescue in Norwalk, one of our rescue partners, so that a proper home could be found for him. Buddy was placed in a foster home on July 22 by Leader of the Pack Rescue where he was reported to be doing very well. Buddy was subsequently adopted by a couple in Middletown and was reportedly shot by the adopter's boyfriend 40 hours after his adoption. There was no provocation and in fact, "Buddy" was confined in a kennel, posing no threat to anyone.

The Connecticut Humane Society, animal shelters and rescue organizations across the state provide ample opportunity for an owner to surrender their animal safely and with the hope of being relocated to a safe environment. When an animal is in pain and is suffering, a humane form of euthanasia is required. Gunshot and other forms of killing an animal by untrained individuals can lead to pain and suffering and should not be considered humane euthanasia.

I have learned from conversations with law enforcement who have attempted to prosecute a case against those who have shot their animals, including attempts to prosecute "Buddy's death, that prosecution in the past has been short-circuited.

Concepts such as "Buddy's Law" will provide a deterrent to pet owners who callously and negligently shoot their dog or cat instead of contacting their local animal control officer, humane society, veterinarian and other animal rescue organizations. The act of shooting an animal except by those who are trained to do so, leads to pain and suffering and cannot be considered a form of humane euthanasia.

**CHS has identified the "Buddy's Law" initiative as one of its top priorities of 2013 and hopes you will support advocating for the measure to pass this year!**

Thank you for listening to my testimony and for considering favorably approving HB6591. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have regarding my testimony.



**THE HUMANE SOCIETY  
OF THE UNITED STATES**

March 20, 2013

Public Health Committee  
Room 3000, Legislative Office Building  
Hartford, CT 06106  
(860) 240-0560

Re: HB 6591, An act requiring the euthanization of any cat or dog to be performed by a licensed veterinarian

Dear Co-Chair Gerratana, Co-Chair Johnson, and Honorable Members of the Public Health Committee,

On behalf of the Connecticut supporters of The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), I submit this letter in **SUPPORT** of changes to **HB 6591**, with the understanding that the language of the bill will be changed to reflect that all euthanasia be performed by licensed veterinarians (under most circumstances), and will include criminal penalties for non-compliance

The euthanasia of animals has been acknowledged by most animal protection organizations, including The HSUS, as an appropriate and humane means of ending the suffering of an animal in physical distress. It is also used widely to end the lives of animals who have severe behavioral problems, including aggression, and cannot be adopted into an appropriate new home because they pose a threat to the health and safety of people or other animals.

The use of euthanasia to end the lives of healthy, adoptable animals is more controversial. The practice is still conducted in many parts of the United States for dogs and cats because open-admission shelters and animal control agencies do not turn away animals and do not have sufficient space to house all of the animals who need shelter. These public and private facilities face the lose-lose choice of euthanizing healthy animals or turning them away.

The HSUS advocates the use of a wide range of tools—including training and education of the pet-keeping public to reduce the frequency of animal relinquishment, public and private spay and neuter programs to slow the birth rate for animals, active promotion of adoptions of shelter animals, and aggressive policies to discourage excessive breeding of animals, especially from puppy mills—to create a social environment where the number of people seeking to adopt animals is roughly equivalent to the number of homeless animals.

The HSUS is committed to pursuing a continuing program of investigation, study, and training related to acceptable euthanasia methods. We recommend for use only those methods that cause a rapid loss of consciousness and that cause minimal pain, distress, and suffering in the animal. We oppose any euthanasia methods or techniques that do not meet these humane principles.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Yours truly,

*Annie Hornish*

**Annie Hornish**  
Connecticut State Director  
The Humane Society of the United States  
Cell: (860) 966-5201; Email: [ahornish@humanesociety.org](mailto:ahornish@humanesociety.org)

Public Health Committee  
Room 3000, Legislative Office Building  
Hartford, CT 06106  
(860) 240-0560

Re: HB 6591, An act requiring the euthanization of any cat or dog to be performed by a licensed veterinarian

Dear Co-Chair Gerratana, Co-Chair Johnson, and Honorable Members of the Public Health Committee,

On behalf of the Connecticut supporters of The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), I submit this letter in **SUPPORT** of changes to **HB 6591**, with the understanding that the language of the bill will be changed to reflect that all euthanasia be performed by licensed veterinarians (under most circumstances), and will include criminal penalties for non-compliance

The euthanasia of animals has been acknowledged by most animal protection organizations, including The HSUS, as an appropriate and humane means of ending the suffering of an animal in physical distress. It is also used widely to end the lives of animals who have severe behavioral problems, including aggression, and cannot be adopted into an appropriate new home because they pose a threat to the health and safety of people or other animals.

The use of euthanasia to end the lives of healthy, adoptable animals is more controversial. The practice is still conducted in many parts of the United States for dogs and cats because open-admission shelters and animal control agencies do not turn away animals and do not have sufficient space to house all of the animals who need shelter. These public and private facilities face the lose-lose choice of euthanizing healthy animals or turning them away.

The HSUS advocates the use of a wide range of tools—including training and education of the pet-keeping public to reduce the frequency of animal relinquishment, public and private spay and neuter programs to slow the birth rate for animals, active promotion of adoptions of shelter animals, and aggressive policies to discourage excessive breeding of animals, especially from puppy mills—to create a social environment where the number of people seeking to adopt animals is roughly equivalent to the number of homeless animals.

The HSUS is committed to pursuing a continuing program of investigation, study, and training related to acceptable euthanasia methods. We recommend for use only those methods that cause a rapid loss of consciousness and that cause minimal pain, distress, and suffering in the animal. We oppose any euthanasia methods or techniques that do not meet these humane principles.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Yours truly,

*Annie Hornish*

**Annie Hornish**  
Connecticut State Director  
The Humane Society of the United States  
Cell: (860) 966-5201; Email: [ahornish@humanesociety.org](mailto:ahornish@humanesociety.org)



Sen. Gerratana, Rep. Johnson, Sen. Slossberg, Rep. Miller, Sen. Welch, Rep. Srinivasan and other distinguished members of the Public Health Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to deliver this testimony to your committee. My name is Gordon Willard, Executive Director at the Connecticut Humane Society. I have been with the Connecticut Humane Society for nearly three years and have headed animal welfare agencies for 30 years. I am here to testify in support of the concept in HB6591.

Previous drafts of this bill contained a penalty provision that would provide a punishment to anyone violating the intent of the bill. The Connecticut Humane Society urges the committee to add a penalty provision to the bill where any person who uses gunshot and causes an animal to suffer is in violation of the bill and would be charged with a felony. Without the penalty provision, this bill would become ineffective, would not clearly instruct law enforcement and our judiciary, and would not reflect Connecticut's wishes to protect animals from pain and suffering.

I am uniquely qualified to speak about this bill because "Buddy" was one of my dogs. Buddy was a German shepherd surrendered by his owner to the Connecticut Humane Society in Westport. Buddy was transferred to Leader of the Pack Rescue in Norwalk, one of our rescue partners, so that a proper home could be found for him. Buddy was placed in a foster home on July 22 by Leader of the Pack Rescue where he was reported to be doing very well. Buddy was subsequently adopted by a couple in Middletown and was reportedly shot by the adopter's boyfriend some 40 hours after his adoption. There was no provocation and in fact, Buddy was confined in a kennel, posing no threat to anyone.

I have learned from conversations with law enforcement who have attempted to prosecute a case against those who have shot their animals, including attempts to prosecute Buddy's death, that prosecution in the past has been short-circuited.

Regarding the language that preserves the Connecticut Humane Society's authority to euthanize animals, I am compelled for the sake of the animals we serve to besiege the committee to maintain that provision. CHS handles over 6,000 animals a year at three

animal care and adoption facilities within the State. We treat thousands more at our low-fee, donor subsidized animal care clinic.

The Newington branch of CHS for the most part has a paid veterinarian and vet tech staff on duty five and a half days a week. The two satellite shelters have a veterinarian on duty once a week and at least one veterinary technician five days a week; however the shelters remain open seven days a week. We are often presented with pets that are in serious medical condition where euthanasia is warranted. Owners have attempted to go to local veterinarians for help or have been unable to secure help because they lack the funds. They come to all of our shelters looking for assistance and often, we provide that last act of humanity regardless of payment. It is performed by trained individuals, often a veterinarian or veterinary technician, using the same practices, drugs, and protocols used by any veterinary hospital. We can provide humane euthanasia for the animal's sake.

I have a long and thorough background in ensuring animal care workers are properly trained to perform euthanasia. I was on the task force in New York State that wrote the regulations and the training program. I provided specialized training to more than 400 animal care workers who became certified euthanasia technicians. I taught, tested and recommended those individuals to the State which certified them, upon my recommendation. New York State and at least 38 other states trust trained individuals.

I also personally held a Federal DEA license and could purchase, dispense and administer controlled substances. I am fully aware of the requirements for purchasing, using and managing controlled substances. I am here to say that qualified euthanasia technicians exist in a majority of the States; they are not veterinarians but they possess the judgment, empathy and compassion of a trained individual.

When an animal is in pain and is suffering, a humane form of euthanasia is required. Gunshot and other forms of killing an animal by untrained individuals can lead to pain and suffering and should not be considered humane euthanasia.

Concepts such as "Buddy's Law" will provide a deterrent to pet owners who callously and negligently shoot their dog or cat instead of contacting their local animal control officer, humane society, veterinarian and other animal rescue organizations. The act of shooting an animal except by those who are trained to do so, leads to pain and suffering and cannot be considered a form of humane euthanasia.

**CHS has identified the "Buddy's Law" initiative as one of its top priorities of 2013 and hopes you will support advocating for the measure to pass this year!**

Thank you for listening to my testimony and for considering favorably approving HB6591 with the added penalty. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have regarding my testimony.



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

REPRESENTATIVE DIANA S. URBAN  
 FORTY THIRD ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING  
 ROOM 4042  
 HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591  
 HOME (860) 535-4868  
 CAPITOL 860-240-8710  
 TOLL FREE 1-800-942-8267  
 FAX (860) 240-0206  
 E-MAIL Diana.Urban@rga.ct.gov

CHAIR  
 COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN  
 RBA SUBCOMMITTEE

MEMBER  
 APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE  
 ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
 PROGRAM REVIEW & INVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE

March 20, 2013

Good Morning Senator Gerratana, Representative Johnson, Senator Welch, Representative Srinivasan and distinguished members of the Public Health Committee. For the record, I am Diana Urban, representing the 43<sup>rd</sup> district. I am here to testify on HB 6591 AN ACT REQUIRING THE EUTHANIZATION OF ANY CAT OR DOG TO BE PREFORMED BY A LICENSED VETERINARIAN.

This bill arises from a situation that Representative Camillo, co-chair of Legislators for Animal Advocacy, followed closely and brought to the attention of other legislators in the caucus. This bill, known as "Buddy's Law", is named after a beautiful 5-year-old German shepherd who had been given up by his owner devastated by his inability to properly care for his beloved dog. Buddy was then shuffled to rescue organizations before finding what appeared to be the perfect adopter; a young woman who wanted Buddy as her only pet. Within 48 hours Buddy was dead, and that is where the story becomes complicated. It is unclear who shot Buddy but it is believed he was shot in the head by the woman's boyfriend because the dog allegedly bit her. There are no records of the woman visiting the hospital even though the couple claims there are pictures of the bite marks which have not surfaced. Buddy did not have a bite history. Although the woman's boyfriend allegedly shot Buddy, at one point this man accused his girlfriend of the shooting. The couple was not arrested or charged with this crime. The "facts" of this story have exposed flaws in current Connecticut guidelines and laws for euthanizing dogs.

Rep. Camillo immediately responded and tried to get to the bottom of the whole sorry story. I will leave it to him to give you the details. However, he also introduced this legislation so that no other dog or cat could be wantonly killed without the protection of legislation. This bill includes a penalty for breaking that law. He has been working on this diligently and it is our hope that this session will be the charm.

In addition, there was some meddling with the language that, in essence, changed the whole thrust of the bill. When made aware of it, the Chairs of this committee were happy to get the language straightened out and I have attached the "new" proposed language. This language has regained focus to only allow a licensed veterinarian euthanize domestic animals, in efforts to prevent another case like Buddy's. If you recall, this language is very similar to an amendment to SB 246 (LCO No. 5325) in session last year regarding this same initiative. This was language already discussed and agreed upon but unfortunately with a shorter session time ran out.

I urge the members of this committee to favorably report this bill in memory of Buddy and put into place statutory safeguards for the euthanization of our beloved household pets.

Sincerely,  
Diana Urban  
Co-Chair, Children's Committee

**Language for HB 6591**

"Sec. 1. (NEW) (Effective from passage) (a) Notwithstanding any provision of the general statutes, whenever any cat or dog is euthanized, such euthanization shall be performed in a humane manner by a licensed veterinarian, provided nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the euthanization of any cat or dog while such cat or dog is attacking a person or another animal under circumstances where a reasonable person would consider such attack life-threatening to a person or another animal or likely to cause serious physical injury to a person or another animal. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to apply to the euthanization of any farm animal or livestock or to the euthanization of any cat or dog by any law enforcement officer in the course of his or her duties.

(b) Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(c) It shall be a defense to prosecution under this section that such person euthanized such cat or dog with a life-threatening injury in order to prevent such cat or dog's further suffering

**PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE**

PUBLIC HEARING MARCH 20, 2013

**RAISED BILL No. 6391 AAC THE PRACTICE OF ADVANCED PRACTICE REGISTERED NURSES.**Testimony of Maryanne Strindberg, IN SUPPORT OF RAISED BILL No. 6391

Senator Gerratana, Representative Johnson, and members of the Committee

**I am a nurse practitioner, board certified in gerontology and psychiatry and I practice in 11 nursing homes in the state of Connecticut. I service over 1000 patients. I have an MD partner and I consult with a variety of attending and specialist MDs throughout my work week.**

**If something were to happen to my current collaborating MD, I would no longer be able to provide care for my patients due to state law requiring a written agreement between myself and a physician. It could take months before I found another physician in my specialty and my patients would be unable to receive care.**

**If the law is changed and the written agreement requirement went away, I would continue to consult and collaborate with my attending physicians and specialists. We do not work in a vacuum. All providers, whether physician, nurse practitioner, pharmacist or psychologist collaborates, consult and seek help and advice from others.**

**Please consider amending this law to discontinue this barrier to my practice for the wellbeing of my patients.**

Maryanne Strindberg, APRN

**Valley Psychiatry**

**558 Hopmeadow Street  
Simsbury, CT 06070  
www.valleypsychiatry.com**

**(860) 408-4882 Tel.  
(860) 408-4885 Fax  
group@valleypsychiatry.com**