

**S.B. No. 274. AN ACT PROHIBITING THE UNREASONABLE CONFINEMENT
AND TETHERING OF DOGS. OPPOSED**

Thank you ... Co-Chairmen Edward Meyer, Co-Chairman Richard Roy, and members of the Environment Committee.

My name is Bruce Tollhurst. I am a life long resident of Connecticut, currently residing at 16 Virginia Rail Dr in Marlborough.

I came here today to talk about S.B. No. 274, An Act Prohibiting the Unreasonable Confinement and Tethering of Dogs. I am **OPPOSED** to S.B. No. 274.

I grew up with dogs. Both my father and grandfather owned sporting dogs. I have owned and trained sporting dogs myself for more than 35 years. I have competed in numerous field trials and hunting competitions through various local clubs as well as AKC, NAVHD, AHDC, NAGDOG and Warrior's Mark events. I am a member and currently the Secretary of the *American Hunting Dog Club*, a club dedicated to Training the Sporting Dog. I think my credentials vouch for my knowledge of dogs.

Under the revisions to Section 23-350a of the general statutes as offered in S.B. No. 274, I would be in violation of the new law. My dogs are kenneled in a 7 x 12 foot run. That is 84 square feet, not the 100 sq ft required in the proposed statute. I train my dogs with a chain collar, what many refer to as a "choke collar". I clip the ends of the collar together as a training aid. I do not use the "choke" feature. My young dogs are tethered during training using the "chain collar" while they wait their turn on the training table or working in the field And this would be defined as an "unreasonable manner" because I am not always in visual range of the dogs during this time.

I submit to you, that the suggested wording is in itself "unreasonable". It is not the size of a kennel that impacts a dog's well being. My dogs are happy, healthy and content in their kennels, with just 84 sq. ft. They are dry, have benches to get off the ground, and are kept clean daily. It is the conditions within the kennels, not the size of the kennel that creates a good or bad environment for a dog. Training and or tethering with a "chain collar" is not in itself "unreasonable". It is not the collar as much as the fit of the collar and the effects of the collar over a period of time. Rubbing, sores, pulled hair by any collar.... that is what should be seen as "unreasonable".

If the criteria of for "unreasonable", as stated in S.B No. 274, were actually valid, then it would be inappropriate to exempt various commercial operations from this statute. Poor treatment of a dog is "poor treatment", it is not who administers it.

The current statutes already provide the tools needed to protect our canine friends ... and we should use and enforce those laws NOT MAKE more laws that are themselves, "unreasonable".

Please do not approve this bill.

Thank you.

Bruce Tollhurst
16 Virginia Rail Dr.
Marlborough, CT 06447
(860) 295-0327