

ROCHESTER HISTORY

Edited by JOSEPH W. BARNES, *City Historian*

VOL. XXXV

OCTOBER 1973

No. 4

Friend of Every Friendless Beast

A Centennial History of The Humane Society
of Rochester and Monroe County

By JOSEPH W. BARNES

The appearance of organized efforts to protect animals from abuse in late nineteenth century America has been characterized as a unique chapter in the history of social change. Before the appearance of humane societies, in Rochester and elsewhere, barbaric treatment of animals—in the midst of a social order known to loudly proclaim its moral righteousness—was routinely accepted by the public at large. Within a relatively short period of time, humane societies were instrumental in bringing the misuse of animals to the fore of public consciousness. In addition, these organizations adopted an activist position with regard to the immediate abuses they saw about them, resorting to legislation and the strict enforcement of laws designed to relieve the common condition of animals. Perhaps most importantly, advocates of the humane treatment of animals never lost sight of the principle that cruelty to animals was demoralizing to those that practiced it and witnessed it. As an opposite principle, they saw that improved consideration for animals must improve the ethical quality of life. In this sense, the cause of humane treatment has been a factor helping to account for broader changes in human sensibility as well as a barometer of ethical progress.

ROCHESTER HISTORY, published quarterly by the Rochester Public Library, distributed free at the Library, by mail 50 cents per year. Address correspondence to City Historian, Rochester Public Library, 115 South Ave., Rochester, N. Y. 14604

While Rochester was a follower and not an originator of the humane society idea, individuals who actively participated in the work of the society here assumed national leadership in advancing the concept of humane education. If, as must be true, the principal contribution of humane society work lies in the changing of human attitudes, then Rochesterians should feel a sense of pride and obligation towards their society. The account which follows chronicles the origins of the organization now called The Humane Society of Rochester and Monroe County, traces its evolution during the past one hundred years of social change, and ends with the recent establishment of its impressive new facility, Lollypop Farm.

The humane movement in America began with the work of Henry Bergh (1811-1888), who ranks among the most enigmatic reformers whom the nineteenth century produced. Bergh had been a bit of a gadfly, a wealthy New Yorker with nothing better to do with time and money than travel and pursue gentlemanly pleasures. During the first two-thirds of his life, his one serious interest, if he could be said to have one, was the authorship of bad plays and poems which only he found humorous. For a brief period during the Civil War, he held a post with the American Legation at St. Petersburg, but resigned the job as a result of the suddenly acquired obsession which dominated his remaining years.

Upon returning to New York, Bergh proceeded with single-minded determination to organize the first American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. A charter for the society, granted by the New York State Legislature April 10, 1866, was followed quickly by anti-cruelty legislation which empowered the ASPCA to enforce the law. "Bergh's" statute read, in part, "every person who shall, by his act or neglect, maliciously kill, maim, wound, injure, torture, or cruelly beat any horse, mule, cow, cattle, sheep, or other animal belonging to himself or another, shall, upon conviction, be adjudged guilty of

a misdemeanor.” Bergh and his new society pursued the cause with revolutionary zeal on the streets of New York, halting overloaded horse cars, stopping dog and cock fights, and arresting animal torturers of every stripe. Bergh never shunned publicity, good or bad, and frequently made himself an object of ridicule—as when he demanded that fish dealers place pillows under the heads of upsidedown turtles awaiting sale. When criticized, Bergh debated his enemies at length in letters-to-the-editor columns. Such tactics accomplished their intended purpose. Even those individuals who differed with what they considered the extreme positions of the ASPCA were eventually persuaded that its members were sincere. Although a few influential persons were unable to adjust to Henry Bergh’s self-righteous and sometimes grating personality, his name became almost a household word and his crusade a thing to be taken seriously.

At the beginning, efforts to protect the animals from brutal treatment were limited to New York City, where Henry Bergh and his associates concentrated their energies. Soon, however, well-intentioned persons in other parts of the nation began learning about Bergh, his organization, and his legislative program. On May 9, 1873, the Rochester *Democrat and Chronicle* noted the formation of an SPCA chapter in Buffalo. An anonymous correspondent asked the newspaper what was to be done about organizing an SPCA chapter in Rochester. The newspaper suggested that the interested party get in touch with Bergh, and added:

Every day we see horses on the streets overloaded and needlessly beaten. When the canal opens there will be hundreds of miserable beasts crawling along the towpath—the “galled jades” wincing under the collar at every step.

A few days later, the newspaper printed in full a letter from Bergh to his Rochester sympathizer. In so many words, Bergh said that if Buffalo could organize an SPCA chapter, why couldn’t Rochester? He then outlined a plan of action for in-

terested persons: first, they should “call upon a few of your most influential citizens” and get their signatures on a commitment to support a local SPCA; then the mayor’s help should be enlisted to call a public meeting. After the Rochester chapter organized itself and elected a slate of officers, Bergh would send a document making it an official section of the ASPCA. It could then appoint three “or even one” agent to enforce the anti-cruelty laws.

After a few months of scattered publicity, a meeting was finally called in the mayor’s office on November 11, 1873. The participants adjourned to the city council room where Acting Mayor George Aldridge (father of the subsequent Boss, George W. Aldridge, Jr.) served as temporary chairman. William H. Cheney, manufacturer of cast iron store fronts and decorative iron grill-work, was elected as the group’s first president. Mrs. George W. Fisher, a prominent clubwomen, and Mrs. William Witherspoon were elected vice-presidents, and Mrs. Edgar Holmes and Mrs. Samuel H. Lattimore, wife of the science professor at the University, were named as secretaries.

On November 21, the second meeting of the nascent SPCA of Rochester drew a large audience of interested persons whose participation was invited. On January 6, 1874, the society considered itself officially organized as the Bergh Association of Rochester and appointed William H. Griffin as its first enforcement agent. Under state law, Griffin had the power of a policeman to act in any case of cruelty to animals. He opened the society’s first office at number 57 in the old Reynolds Arcade. Judging from accounts of animal mistreatment during this era, Griffin had his work cut out for him. A typical episode titled “A Case for Bergh” appeared in a Rochester paper during April of 1874: a man on Clinton Street used his whip freely on his stationary horse, but to no avail. Finally, the man tied a rope around the horse’s neck and attached the other end to a team of horses, choking the sick or exhausted animal into compliance.

An appalling incident one Sunday afternoon in 1874 helped dramatize the need in Rochester for an organization devoted to

the prevention of cruelty. It was described in one local newspaper as "one of the most thrilling and exciting accidents of the kind that ever occurred . . . at the Central Railroad Bridge, over the Genesee River, in this city." A portion of a freight train crossing the bridge derailed, sending a loaded cattle car into the rapids just above the main falls. Seventeen head of cattle were pitched into the swift current of the falls ledge, where the depth of water was from two to four feet. Some of the animals stood in the water unharmed or with minor injuries. Five of them which had apparently suffered broken legs were quickly carried over the falls. The remaining twelve struggled against the current. As the afternoon wore on, a crowd of persons estimated to number up to twelve thousand gathered to watch the suffering animals. Fortunate indeed, said the same newspaper, that the derailment had not occurred an hour earlier when the railroad bridge was crowded with pedestrians returning from church. A new hazard developed as the mob of spectators, which no doubt included many of those same churchgoers, crowded the railroad bridge and strained its railings.

While police made efforts to control the crowd and railroad crews worked to repair damage to the bridge, the New York Central depot master sold all seventeen cattle to two local butchers. After a quick consultation among railroad men, police and the butchers, it was agreed that it would be easier to force the animals over the falls than to retrieve them in some other manner. Ropes were procured. "Accordingly," says the news account, "one by one the animals were drawn towards the eastern shore, the ropes were let loose, and they were consigned to their fate."

These proceedings provided entertainment for thousands of Rochesterians during the better part of that afternoon:

As the animals were forced over the falls much interest was manifested in their fate by the immense crowd, and their appearance in the roaring waters below was anxiously looked for. . . . Among the crowd below the falls were butchers and others, who on fishing out the carcasses of the dead animals,

or hauling the living but injured animals ashore, went to work and killed, skinned, and cut them up.

Humanitarian persons were justifiably horrified by this episode. They were particularly appalled by the indifference or actual enjoyment displayed by thousands of the spectators. The newly organized Bergh Association dispatched a telegram to Henry Bergh in New York, requesting that he come to Rochester and address the people on the subject of cruelty to animals. Because of the press of other duties, Bergh was obliged to decline. Nevertheless, the incident of the seventeen cattle on a Sunday afternoon served some useful purpose. It dramatized to local humanitarians the degree of brutality towards animals the general public was willing to accept. Clearly, one of the major tasks lying before the new association was the education of people in the principles of decent treatment of animals.

One special challenge which the Bergh Association of Rochester shared with humane societies in other upstate cities was the policing of the Erie Canal. Horses and mules on the towpath were notoriously overworked, and, owing to the nature of their task, were subject to injuries not generally shared by other draft animals. The irregular strain of the towline suffered twelve hours a day wore deep sores, or "galls," under the collars of the beasts. The problem came to the attention of Henry Bergh himself in New York, where a few of the animals could be examined on boats tied up in the harbor. "It is no uncommon spectacle," he said, "to see the collar wholly imbedded in the flesh, which has become green with corruption and alive with worms." Agent Griffin in Rochester set about correcting such evils during the canal season of 1874, and was assaulted several times by boatmen and lock tenders for his efforts. Following one such incident, a local editorialist came to Griffin's defense:

Yesterday he attempted to examine a span of mules towing a boat and was at once assaulted by Captain John H. Bonnett, who choked him. Bonnett was arrested and at once had an examination in Police Court, where he was convicted and fined twenty dollars. The sooner that canal men learn to treat their

horses humanely the better it will be for them, and they must also learn that Mr. Griffin is a police officer empowered to make arrests for violations of the cruelty to animals law, and for that matter for other offenses.

After a full year of operation, the Rochester Bergh Association issued its first set of statistics describing its activities. During 1874, 312 cases of mistreatment had been reported which resulted in 182 arrests and 65 convictions. Fourteen fines totalled \$340. Agent Griffin admonished 245 persons and ordered 8 horses killed. And, as leaders of the local humane society would repeatedly be forced to do during the next one hundred years, President Cheney appealed for additional financial help from benevolent persons—in this case so that the association would continue to be able to pay an agent's salary.

Fines levied against persons who mistreated animals were a significant source of revenue at least during the society's first decade. In 1876, for example, the society spent \$858, but received \$328 in fines. It is indeed unfortunate that a similar arrangement could not be effected today, and that those who carelessly allow domestic pets to reproduce, abandon them, or otherwise mistreat them could not be forced to pay a large share of the humane society's costs.

Judging from news accounts of its activities in the late 1870s, the association attempted a full range of humane activities during its initial period—despite the financial hardships imposed by the national depression which began in 1873. A sampling of newspaper stories of the association's efforts in its first years would include the following: February, 1876, its agent protests the treatment of cattle in a Goodman Street slaughter yard; February, 1877, the association persuades the city water commissioners to provide additional watering troughs and reports on its successes with improving the condition of canal animals the previous season; May, 1877, the association's agitation persuades a group of Rochester "sportsmen" to substitute glass balls for pigeons at a rifle match at the fairgrounds; January, 1878, the

association (unsuccessfully) tries to obtain \$500 from the County Board of Supervisors; January, 1880, the Bergh Association sponsors a school essay contest on the theme of cruelty to animals.

The task of the humane society and its enforcement agent was a difficult one. Draft animals were of great economic importance in this period. Throughout the nineteenth century they drew the boats along the canal which accounted for the Empire State's rapid development and helped account for its pre-eminence. In the cities, man was dependent on horses to move food, coal, and all other articles of commerce. Until electrification by trolley in the late 1880s, horses also supplied motive power for the street railways which permitted the expansion of cities over broad areas. It was not at all uncommon in the nineteenth century to use various animals harnessed in treadmill arrangements supplying power for mills, wood and metalworking shops, and even riverboats.

Animals, then, were an important part of the machinery of the nineteenth century, and it is not surprising that they were often treated as no more than machines. Of course, an intelligent owner of a machine does not normally neglect its maintenance or press it beyond the limits of its endurance; were it not for economic motives, the treatment of animals in the last century might have been far worse than it actually was. Sometimes, however, economic motives were the cause of mistreatment. An independent teamster in financial straits, struggling to support his family, might starve or overwork his horse rather than see his children go hungry.

The managers of the East Avenue Omnibus line in Rochester used horses that were too old for service during the 1880s. "They are wore out!" said the Humane Society agent, adding that the sight of the horses being whipped to pull the buses up the East Main Street hill was "a shame to Rochester." But the managers of the East Avenue line had an obligation to their stockholders to get all possible use out of a machine before its replacement;

perhaps they were then investigating the possibilities of electrification and saw no point in the investment that young horses would represent.

In any case, the owners of Rochester's horsecar lines were little kinder to their human employees than they were to their livestock. The working day for a horsecar driver was 14 hours until 1888, when it was reduced to 11½, and drivers stood in the open at the front of the cars exposed to all types of weather. When the drivers struck for a further reduction in hours and restoration of wage cuts in 1889, the owners hired Pinkerton thugs armed with revolvers to drive the cars; even the general public was angered at this sight and mobbed the cars on several occasions in the course of the strike—which was unsuccessful.

The fact that this was an age when man's inhumanity to man was often as visible as his inhumanity to suffering animals induced some of the Bergh Association's leaders to assume a new task less than two years after the association's founding. In Rochester, as in New York City, the formation of a society for preventing cruelty to animals led to similar efforts on behalf of children. On September 8, 1875, William Cheney and others applied for a charter for a new organization—a chapter of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

It may be the cause for some bewilderment at this ordering of priorities. A partial explanation is provided by the incident which led to the formation of the first SPCC in New York City. There, the infamous case of "Little Mary Ellen" was made public in 1874. Mary Ellen was the ward of one Mary Connolly, who made a regular practice of beating and mutilating the little girl in addition to starving her. Nothing was done about her case until an agent of the ASPCA persuaded a judge to issue a writ of *habeas corpus* by authority of the same laws designed to protect animals. Mary Ellen's condition was so shocking to the judge that he sentenced Mrs. Connolly to a year in jail; ultimately, Mary Ellen found a good adoptive family. Soon after this incident, persons active in the New York ASPCA, led by Henry

Bergh, participated in the formation of a separate SPCC, and it was news of this development which influenced the organization of a Rochester chapter. Not surprisingly, the Rochester Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children drew largely on the same pool of volunteer time and money that energized the Bergh Association. At a joint meeting of the organizations held in January, 1878, members decided that the efforts of the two groups—which shared many of the same individuals—should be coordinated. Two years later, the Bergh Association and the Rochester SPCC formally merged to form The Humane Society of Rochester, New York for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children and Animals. A similar merger never took place in New York City, partly because of Bergh's objections.

Between 1880 and 1897, the Rochester Humane Society divided its efforts between the needs of children and animals. The annual reports for these years carried separate sections dealing with the "Committee on Children" and the "Committee on Animals." Undeniably, there was substantial logic in the joining of efforts to protest mistreatment of the helpless; on the other hand, the joint venture invited friction between those who volunteered to serve on the children's committee and those who worked on the animal committee. How should the Humane Society's resources be divided? The dilemma was one which plagued the Rochester society for seventeen years and which was overcome only when the two halves of the society finally agreed to part.

In the 1880s the activities of the Rochester Humane Society gained real momentum. One outgrowth of its sponsorship of school essay contests was the formation, in 1884, of "Boards of Mercy" in the public and parochial schools. The effort to instruct schoolchildren in the principles of humane treatment of animals became one of the Rochester society's most successful activities. In later years, society members contributed to this program by traveling from school to school presenting "stere-

opticon" lectures. In the words of the 1910 annual report, the society's Humane Education Committee "implants in the youth of today, who will be the men of tomorrow, a proper conception of their relation and duty to animals." The humane education program, which originated in Rochester, was widely praised and copied by humane societies throughout the United States.

It was also in the 1880s that the society obtained its first animal ambulance and raised funds for a permanent shelter. The society found two stalwart benefactors in Mr. and Mrs. Robert Rand, who first donated the ambulance in 1886, and then contributed \$10,000 towards purchase of a shelter. An additional \$3,000 was raised for the purchase of the property at 90 Sophia Street (Plymouth Avenue North), which was occupied in 1891.

The Humane Society's first shelter, consisting of a substantial house, barns, and other outbuildings, was conceived of as a temporary haven for wayward or neglected children as well as for lost and injured animals. The need for such a shelter had been well established during the 1880s by the society's numerous discoveries of child mistreatment. In August of 1884 the society brought to light the case of a thirteen year old girl wandering homeless and "dependent on criminal friends for support." The society's spokesman said there were many more such waifs in Rochester—but that the society needed more funds to do an adequate job for them. In 1886 the society discovered an eight year old girl starving in an attic, the child of drunken parents. In 1888 the society took an active interest in the care of one Lizzie O'Neil whose father was arrested and convicted on charges of cruelly beating her. Wishing to protect her from further mistreatment, the society took out guardianship papers for the girl. But the organization had no means of accommodating her, and she was sent first to the State Industrial School and then to a Catholic orphanage—neither of which suited Lizzie. In the end, much to the society's discomfiture, she returned to live with her father.

By the end of the 1880s, it was becoming clear that the society's attentions were drawn increasingly to the needs of children. In the year ending September, 1889, for example, the society received 293 complaints involving children and 274 involving animals. During that year the society made 32 arrests resulting in 27 convictions in cases of child mistreatment or abandonment, but made only 4 arrests resulting in 2 convictions in cases of animal mistreatment.

Between 1890 and 1897 the society permitted its efforts to become even further diffused, as one after another social cause or moral reform was taken up by the clergymen who were its frequent leaders. Some of the reforms advanced by its leaders at this time might strike the modern reader as quixotic. However, it should be stated that the positions assumed by the Humane Society were fairly representative of the impulse toward moral reform typical of the 1890s, and that many of the causes with which the society became identified were perhaps not as petty or outlandish to contemporaries as they seem to persons today.

In May of 1893, for example, the Humane Society was much in the news as an opponent of something called "child pedestrianism," which, as it turned out, was the use of minors in a walking race. The "race" alluded to was an 1890s phenomenon akin to the dance marathons of the 1920s, the long-range "walks" for good causes popular with today's youth, and the televised female roller derby. The walking race at the Washington Rink in Rochester in 1893 limited participants' walks to four hours at one time, and prizes were given by a commercial promoter who distributed awards according to the participant's mileage accumulated over several evenings. While all of this sounds harmless enough on the whole, one may speculate on the degree of sincere outrage in this account taken from a newspaper which joined in the Humane Society's protest:

The audience that was in attendance last evening was made up of "sports" and "toughs." After frequent and oft repeated visits to the bar, which is the most lucrative adjunct of the

show, they returned to the railing, where they ogled and leered at the children in short skirts who were pacing off the weary miles. Many of the men made remarks of a highly improper nature to the unfortunate women as they passed by.

In the sports columns of the same newspaper—the *Union and Advertiser*—were tallied the nightly standings of the seven participants!

One year after the child pedestrianism affair, the Humane Society again made headlines with a report it was joining the “Committee of 100” to lead a drive against law-breaking saloon keepers. Specifically, the society wanted to enjoin the common practice of sending children to the corner saloon to fetch a pail or pitcher of beer—through enforcement of the law prohibiting saloon keepers from allowing children in their establishments. In addition, the society’s clerical leaders wished to see better enforcement of the law prohibiting curtain enclosures in front of saloon booths, a device popular among young sports entertaining “girls who should know better” (but didn’t).

These and several other social issues in which the Humane Society repeatedly involved itself during the 1890s—notably the issue of child theatrical performances—seemed to divert a good deal of its energy away from the purposes for which the Bergh Association of Rochester had originally been organized. Events during the 1890s were not wholly without significance for the society’s later history, however. In 1894, the society came into conflict for the first time with city officials over management of a proposed new dog pound. The local press described this conflict as a “hot contest”; in brief, city officials were opposed to having the Humane Society in supervision of the new pound, and vice versa.

The reason for the city’s reluctance to turn management of its new dog pound over to a private group (albeit one possessing some degree of legal authority by virtue of its state charter) was the belief that the pound would become a moneymaker. In New York City, officials had made the municipal pound a significant

revenue-producing agency. Owners of stray animals who came to claim them paid license fees and a fine for their redemption—a beneficent and legal form of extortion. Animals who were not claimed became a valuable commodity following execution. The carcasses were sold to private contractors who rendered them out for oil; the hides were sold for the production of dog-skin gloves. In addition, a minority of dogs with some pedigree could be sold alive at their wholesale value.

Rochester's dog licensing law of 1894 and its proposed pound was the latest in a long series of attempts by the city to achieve some kind of control over its dog population. In 1819, just two years after incorporation as a village, Rochester published its first dog ordinance. The 1819 law imposed a tax on dog ownership and prohibited allowing dogs to run loose during the month of March. Later, the statute was continually revised in response to the real or imagined threats of rabies epidemics. The city council issued new prohibitions against loose dogs or passed "muzzling" or "mad dog" ordinances in 1831, 1832, 1833, 1837, 1839, 1845, and 1846. In 1854, the City Superintendent was authorized by the council to dispose of any unmuzzled dog roaming the streets. In the 1860s, the council directed the City Assessors to produce censuses of the city's canine population. This proceeding was suggested by the belief that there were too many dogs. As a matter of interest, the assessors' census in 1862 revealed that there were 3,000 dogs in the city, and a new census in 1867 revealed 2,694 dogs. The city's human population in those years was about 48,000 and 51,000, respectively. New fears of rabies epidemics—and countless reports of attacks on persons by vicious dogs—generated further amendments to the animal control laws in 1867, 1868, and 1876. In addition, city authorities repeatedly announced campaigns to enforce existing laws against stray dogs during these decades.

By the early 1890s, the city had accumulated a lengthy series of provisions in its animal control ordinances. No person was

permitted to keep cows, goats, chickens, geese, ducks, or other such animals within city limits. Dog owners were required to keep their animals either leashed or muzzled at all times, and faced severe penalties for non-compliance. Violation of the leash law made owners liable to fines and a jail term of up to 150 days.

As was (and is) the case with all local nuisance regulations, it proved far more difficult to enforce the animal ordinances than it was to toughen them. For example, in the decades preceding 1894 the city council possessed authority to appoint persons with the specific authority to shoot dogs considered a public menace, but had never done so. City policemen and constables were understandably reluctant to resort to such a drastic measure, even in clear-cut cases of rabies, due to consideration for the property rights of owners, not to mention the claims of conscience. By the 1890s, the growing urban character of Rochester's environment was making death-by-shooting a questionable means of dealing with uncontrolled animals in any case.

On the other hand, by the mid-1890s it was becoming clear that *something* had to be done. The large number of unlicensed and uncontrolled dogs in Rochester's streets from time to time inspired private citizens to take matters into their own hands. As early as 1877, the local press reported the existence of dog poisoners, who generally chose to remain anonymous. In one instance, in the summer of 1885, ten dogs were discovered dead from poisoning on the same day in the 13th ward. Public reaction to such reports was generally negative. Clearly, neither the frontier style of shooting on the spot nor haphazard and inhumane efforts at poisoning were satisfactory solutions to the dog problem.

In the late 1880s and early 1890s a new dimension was added to the problem. In cities throughout the United States bicycle riding was evolving from a fad pursued by a few enthusiasts into a national sport. Bicycles were also now being used as an important adjunct to commercial ventures, in delivery and messenger services, and even in police work. Perhaps, through long fami-

liarity, man's best friend had reached some degree of accommodation with his second best friend, the horse. The bicycle was an unlegged beast of another color. The sight of a bicycle whizzing by was guaranteed to stir atavistic impulses in more than a few canine hearts. Then, as today, few dog owners troubled themselves with the task of properly instructing their pets against indulging in the fun of the chase.

As a result, by 1894, Rochester's unlicensed, unleashed, and generally untrained dog population had earned for itself an entirely new set of enemies. The city's "wheelmen," estimated to number between five and six thousand that year, became an organized and outspoken constituency demanding better enforcement if not complete revision of the existing dog ordinances. One spokesman for the cyclists said, "it is impossible to ride through certain sections of the city without being continually endangered if not actually injured by the numerous dogs chasing us." The frequent incidence of bitten bicyclists in the 1890s supplemented an already existing situation. From time to time the local press complained loudly about the large number of attacks on persons by the minority of truly vicious dogs. Attacks were characterized as "daily" occurrences, sometimes resulted in serious injuries, and seemed more often than not to involve children.

In June of 1894 the office of the city's Corporation Counsel began reviewing existing dog law. Curiously, almost every feature of a complete control system was already "on the books": the dog owner was not only required to have his animal leashed or muzzled, but was also required to attach an identification tag to the collar. The city's attorneys decided that what was lacking was effective machinery for enforcement. The omissions in the law were speedily corrected with a new "dog ordinance" approved in council.

In brief, the new law called for establishment of a city dog pound, appointment of a Poundmaster, and purchase of a \$1.00

tag by all dog owners. With the threat of impoundment of their unlicensed pets looming in the future, owners flocked to city hall on September 1, 1894, the law's effective date. Over 100 dogs were tagged that morning. According to one newspaper account, however, not all the owners were filled with joy!

One gentleman wanted permission to have the number engraved on a solid silver plate which is on his dog's collar instead of paying the \$1.00 for the little tag. When told that he had to buy the tag anyway he expressed himself in a forcible style. "This is a swindle." he said, "to make people pay \$1 for this thing. . . . I would like to know what kind of a city government this is anyway."

It was evident from the manner of some of the "Kickers" that they believed City Clerk Gregg, City Messenger Pulver, and Assistant Messenger Lavin divided the fees as spoils or perquisites, or at least that they had a handsome "rake-off." As a matter of fact, however, all the money, except what the German silver nickel plated tags cost, goes into the city treasury and the clerk keeps a strict account of all money received from this source.

When the new dog law took effect on September 1st, the city had not yet established a pound, nor had it acted on the Humane Society's request to be placed in charge of it. In October, the society presented a written petition to city council clarifying its position *vis-a-vis* its proposed management of the pound; the society agreed to remit all moneys received from tag sales and redemption fees to the city, provided the city pay all operating costs. The petition pointed to the example of other cities where the local Humane Society was given charge of the city pound. Accordingly, city council directed the Corporation Counsel to draw up a contract detailing the rights and responsibilities of the two parties should the city and society agree to such an arrangement.

In a few months, the two parties announced that they had smoothed over their differences. According to the contract agreement, signed February 7, the Humane Society was to "assume

charge of the vagrant dogs, chickens, cattle, horses, etc., found running at large throughout the city, and provide for their accommodation one or more suitable pounds, which are to be conducted under the management of the society's officials." Further, the Humane Society was to appoint the pound keeper and dog catcher, and receive all moneys from sale of dog tags, fines, and penalties. In a spirit of good will and optimism, the society officers assured the membership at their monthly meeting that the society will "inaugurate an active warfare upon the owners of dogs who neglect to register and tag them."

The signing of the contract to operate the municipal pound marked the beginning of the end of the Humane Society's joint concerns for children and animals. At the same monthly meeting during which the new contract was discussed, (and during which the society's animal agent made his regular report), the society's children's matron reported on activities at the shelter. "The children," said Matron Winslow, "10 girls and 20 boys, have all been in good health. They have been quiet and orderly, and passed the time happily with us. A good home has been obtained for one of them in the country. . . . We have received calls from some who were formerly with us and who are now doing well."

Two years later, the society divided into two parts, becoming the Humane Society of Rochester for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Rochester Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

By 1897 it had become apparent that the two halves of the society were tending to two rather different types of business. The work of the animal department was now conducted at the new city pound on Falls Street in the river flats, while the children's department had now entirely occupied the shelter on Sophia Street. According to the Humane Society's spokesmen, the increased work load necessitated the election of two separate sets of officers. Following the 1897 division, the Rochester SPCC continued on its separate course, investigating cases of child

abuse and providing temporary lodgings for homeless waifs and delinquents at the Children's Shelter. Gradually, however, children's welfare became a matter of pressing public concern and by the late 1960s Monroe County had assumed nearly all the functions of the SPCC.

For the next half century the Humane Society devoted most of its attention to two areas: coping with an ever growing excess population of domestic pets and strengthening its humane education programs. Its efforts were ably guided by such men as J. B. Y. Warner, who, as President of the society from 1897 until his death in 1918, repeatedly lobbied for the adoption of strengthened humane laws at Albany and persuaded the Rochester society to employ a traveling lecturer to visit local schools. At the turn of the century Warner declared:

It is fair to assume that a dollar spent in the humane education of children will accomplish more ultimate good than a dollar expended in the prosecution of some hardened wretch who unmercifully abuses dumb animals committed to his care. Create a strong public sentiment against cruelty and there will be few occasions when prosecutions are necessary.

Over the years the society's humane education efforts became increasingly diversified. The traveling lecturer program was supplemented with school essay contests, a junior members list, and free distribution of books about animals.

Even while the cause of humane education was advanced, however, the society persevered in the hard job of enforcing the anti-cruelty statutes. By no means atypical was the case, in 1910, of a horse driven 40 hours without food or rest; the society's agent brought its caretaker before a Brighton magistrate, who sentenced the man to 180 days in the penitentiary. Horses were driven while lame or sore, underfed, beaten with chains, hoses, and shovels, and, on occasion, abandoned to die in fields when no longer ambulatory. The number of investigations of cruelty to horses reached a peak of about 1,000 annually in the years just before World War One. William J. Boyink, the society's

supervising agent and city poundmaster from 1901 to 1952, was still reporting about 300 horse investigations per year as late as 1939.

Inevitably, however, more and more of Boyink's time and that of his assistants was occupied by controlling stray cats and dogs. The number of aged, sick, or homeless strays the society was compelled to destroy crept steadily upward year by year, from slightly over 8,000 in 1910 to over 16,000 annually twenty years later. The expanded work load demanded acquisition of new facilities, equipment, and staff. Despite the fact that its impoundment duties were mandated by the city contract designating the society as the enforcement agency for the animal control laws, the Humane Society took the initiative when it acquired new facilities at 103 St. Paul Street in 1910. In 1927 the society sold that property and used the proceeds to construct a new shelter at 263 Central Avenue, now used as the Rochester Animal Control Center. In the same year the society's fleet of vehicles had grown to four small animal ambulances and a large horse ambulance. Proceeds from the city's dog licensing fees only partially compensated the society for its operating expenses, and it had to raise about 40 per cent of the cost of salaries and supplies from gifts, membership dues, and bequests.

The job of exterminating unwanted animals, a task which was not only unpleasant but contrary to the instincts of people in humane work, earned the society a good deal of unfair criticism. Often the society's adoption and humane education programs and its rescue work were obscured by its "dogcatcher" image, and leaders were compelled to explain that humane destruction in a gas chamber was a kinder way of eliminating animals—far too many in number to be adopted—than abandonment in the streets and death by slow starvation or accident. By the late 1940s the society's work in animal population control was in fact becoming ever more oppressive to its supporters. Numerous public complaints about bad conditions in the pound

at 263 Central Avenue went partly unanswered, as the society and its benefactors could not find the necessary funds for major improvements.

The year 1952 marked the beginning of a new era in the Humane Society's history. Ironically, the society's change of direction and subsequent achievements came as the result of state legislation strongly opposed by many friends of animals. The legislation, known as the Hatch-Metcalf or "dog surrender" act, required municipal pounds to supply hospitals, medical research facilities, and commercial laboratories with unclaimed animals for medical research purposes. Few state enactments have produced the degree of controversy and bitter opposition which characterized this law. In Rochester, the Gannett newspapers rallied to the defense of the medical establishment and other supporters of the Hatch-Metcalf bill, even while letters from the public printed on its editorial page reflected major opposition. While most members of the Humane Society were not among the class of ardent anti-vivisectionists that opposed all use of animals for experimentation, the society's leadership explained that it could not countenance experimentation with animals which had once been pets. A large number of impounded dogs and cats were lost, aged, or diseased pets; to require the Humane Society to relinquish them to laboratories would outrage the principles for which the society existed.

Accordingly, several months before the Hatch-Metcalf act became operative, the executive committee of the society informed the city and three suburban towns with which it now had contracts that it intended to cease dog pound operations. The building and equipment on Central Avenue were sold to the city at an appraised valuation after the county briefly considered assuming animal control responsibilities itself. The Humane Society was thus given the opportunity—indeed, was challenged by the necessity—to discover new programs consistent with its mission of assisting animals and preventing their abuse.

At this critical juncture the society named C. Raymond Naramore, a well known dog expert who had served for thirty-two years as a teacher at West High School, as executive director. Naramore assumed his new task with great dedication and a sense of vision which enabled him, with the help of loyal supporters within the society and generous benefactors, to establish Lollypop Farm, keystone of the society's present humane education program. During his seventeen year directorship Naramore never tired of informing the public on matters affecting the care and treatment of animals; among his other methods was an extensive use of radio and television which earned national recognition. Ignoring personal danger and inconvenience, Naramore was constantly involved in animal rescue work which dramatized the activities of the Humane Society.

After a brief sojourn in rented quarters on Clinton Avenue South, Naramore moved the society's operations to a renovated apartment house on a seven acre site in the suburban town of Henrietta. The new shelter facilitated the proper care of disabled and stray animals, for whom the society now redoubled its efforts to find adoptive homes. The adjacent plot of land permitted establishment of a fenced "farm" for a variety of tame animals—deer, burros, llamas, ducks and geese and others—which delighted visitors of all ages. The farm had two serious purposes, generally lost on a few critics who felt the society should not be in the zoo business. In addition to attracting visitors who frequently became customers for adopted pets, the farm exposed thousands of children annually to gentle animals which they were permitted to touch and feed. This type of experience, it was felt, could be of enormous worth in shaping positive values towards animals and sensitizing people to their needs.

It was with these considerations in mind that the society, in 1963, accepted the gift of almost 140 acres of land in nearby Perinton from Hiram W. Marks, a Rochester businessman and long-term society member. With proceeds from sale of its Hen-

rietta land and private subscriptions, an ambitious new Lollypop Farm and animal shelter were constructed at a cost of three-quarters of a million dollars. Not without a good many headaches Naramore moved the society's animals to the new installation in 1966 and a formal dedication was held in 1967. By now the society's paid employees regularly numbered more than a dozen.

The recent history of the Humane Society of Rochester and Monroe County (frequently known today by the shorter name, Lollypop Farm) dates from that time. Following the death of C. Raymond Naramore in 1969, his capable assistant, Frank M. Rogers, has directed the affairs of the society and built on the achievements of his predecessor. The work of these men has been made possible by the efforts of individuals who serve as officers of the society, members of its Board of Directors, and volunteer workers at the animal shelter. The names of several individuals who have given unusual service in these capacities, as well as those who have added generously to the society's endowment, have been by necessity omitted from this account.

During the last generation the Humane Society of Rochester has made great strides in the field of humane education. Lollypop Farm, which has earned national attention, is supplemented by a variety of programs manned by volunteers and the society staff including school visitations and conducted tours at the shelter during which the "be kind to animals" message is well propagandized. At the same time, the society continues to take primary responsibility for enforcement of the anti-cruelty statutes throughout the metropolitan region. Part of its routine work is the rescue of wild animals which are found in an incredible variety of predicaments; these are given restorative care when needed and released in a Wayne County wildlife sanctuary which was given to the society in 1964.

The most serious challenge facing the Rochester Humane Society is the present crisis of pet overpopulation. It is a problem related to the society's educational programs, since human ignor-

ance and callousness is responsible for the thousands of puppies and kittens annually turned over to the society for adoption or destruction. Even with its vigorous adoption efforts, the society is able to place only a fraction of its animals in its care in new homes, and the rest must be killed. The problem is compounded by the rising cost of animal sterilization procedures. As an ameliorative measure, the society now requires persons who adopt female dogs or cats to post a deposit which is refunded when evidence that the animal has been spayed is produced. Along with humane societies elsewhere, the Rochester organization looks toward strengthened animal ownership regulations at the state level and the possibility of new animal birth control technologies as future solutions to the population crisis.

Meanwhile, at the local level, the society's shelter work and educational programs continue to depend heavily on the contributions and membership dues of private citizens. Despite the fact that its activities include very necessary public services which would have to be assumed by government if the society went out of business, only a small portion of its operating budget is presently subsidized by tax monies. And, unlike other public service agencies, the Humane Society is not supported by the Community Chest. But those who have contributed their time and money to support the work of the Humane Society may find some encouragement in these lines by the poet Longfellow:

*Among the noblest in the land,
Though he may count himself the least,
That man I honor and revere
Who, without favor, without fear,
In the great city dares to stand,
The friend of every friendless beast.*