

10-1-2000

170 Years of Caring: The Animal Welfare Movement in Bangor, Maine

John D. Blaisdell
University of Maine

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mainehistoryjournal>



Part of the [Animal Sciences Commons](#), [Cultural History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Blaisdell, John D.. "170 Years of Caring: The Animal Welfare Movement in Bangor, Maine." *Maine History* 39, 3 (2000): 186-203. <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/mainehistoryjournal/vol39/iss3/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maine History by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.

B M132

BANGOR
Maine

Bangor Humane Society

FOR THE
PROTECTION OF CHILDREN
AND ANIMALS



BANGOR, MAINE
1915

ORGANIZED AND CONDUCTED FOR THE PREVENTION
OF CRUELTY TO CHILDREN AND ANIMALS

The Bangor Humane Society changed its name in 1915 to reflect the organization's concern for the welfare of children as well as animals.

Collections of the Bangor Historical Society.

170 YEARS OF CARING: THE ANIMAL WELFARE MOVEMENT IN BANGOR, MAINE

By JOHN D. BLAISDELL

The history of the animal welfare movement in Bangor, Maine dates to the first decades of the nineteenth century. Over the course of its long history, the movement's emphasis shifted from a focus on livestock and urban workhorses in the nineteenth century to children and animals at the turn of the century and finally to companion animals, primarily cats and dogs. These shifts, the author argues, reflect economic and technological changes as well as a transformation in society's perception of animals. A Maine native, John Blaisdell, is currently working on a book exploring the history of Maine's animal welfare movement. He has a Ph.D. from Iowa State University and teaches in the Department of Animal Science at the University of Maine, Orono.

“**W**HEREAS hard usage of horses, mules, oxen and other dumb creatures tends to render inveterate the temper of cruelty in him who exercises it and to beget the same force by example in others, . . . it is ordered by the town that if any owner of [such animal] shall unreasonably and cruelly beat or abuse [it], such owner . . . shall forfeit for each offence \$1.00.” Written in 1829, the year of Bangor's incorporation, these words made the protection of animals a part of the city's by-laws. From this beginning, the movement to protect animals in Bangor adapted over time to economic and technological changes and to shifts in the perception of the role of animals in society. Despite these changes, animal welfare advocates upheld through the years the basic belief that cruelty to animals was both an insult and a moral affront to a civilized society.

The past 170 years have seen dramatic changes in lifestyle and technology for the residents of cities like Bangor. Adapting and maturing along with the rest of the city, the animal welfare movement experienced four major stages of development. From a beginning as a campaign to protect livestock, increased urbanization after the Civil War helped shift the emphasis to a concern for urban workhorses. In the 1880s, the welfare movement broadened to include concern for children as well as ani-

mals. Later, in the early twentieth century, the arrival of the automobile coincided with the development of state child protective agencies, thus eliminating two concerns. As urban workhorses gradually became less common, and the safety of children became the responsibility of the state, the welfare movement shifted its own efforts to protecting companion animals, particularly dogs and cats. The ability of animal care advocates to adapt to the changing attitudes and needs of their dynamic society no doubt accounts for much of the movement's longevity.

In 1820, when Maine entered the Union, its first state law code included a measure dealing with the mistreatment of animals:

If any person shall willfully and maliciously, passionately, cruelly or barbarously kill, wound, maim, or disfigure any one or more of the horses, sheep or cattle of another, every such offender, and any person aiding and consenting in the commission of such offence, who shall be duly convicted thereof, shall be punished by solitary imprisonment for such term not exceeding six months; and by confinement afterwards to hard labor for such term not exceeding three years, or by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, and by imprisonment in the common gaol not exceeding one year.¹

This statute fell into the category of "crimes of malicious mischief," a type of crime that included arson and destruction of private property. This suggests that early Maine laws were more concerned with the destruction of "animate" private property than with cruelty to animals, a conclusion reinforced by the provision that the animals protected by law must belong to someone else. This attitude was common in Great Britain at this time, where animals were viewed as property, only trivially different from less mobile goods.² One might expect the same attitude for New England.

Available evidence suggests that this was not the case. First, the inclusion of the words "maliciously" and "cruelly" would be unnecessary in a simple property crime. Second, another statute in this same code all but nullifies the property crime argument by noting the following: "Be it enacted, that if any person shall cruelly beat any horse or cattle, and be thereof convicted, he shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$5.00 or by imprisonment in the common gaol for a term not exceeding thirty days."³ Statutes like these, according to one recent study, "represented a new, tentative step forward because no distinction was made as to who owned the animal." For the first time animal welfare laws went beyond the simple ideas of property and took on a new interest: concern for the

animal itself. By contrast, England first passed similar anticruelty legislation in 1822.⁴

The more severe punishment for abusing another's horse or livestock suggests that animals were still seen as property. These early Maine laws appear to be a transition between considering animals as animate property and viewing them as sentient creatures. This transition was fully achieved in 1840 when the second paragraph of this early anticruelty statute was made a separate offence, located in the "offences against chastity, morality and decency."⁵ The first paragraph is a separate offense in the "crimes of malicious mischief and trespasses on property."⁶ Throughout much of the nineteenth century Maine had two approaches to animal abuse. To abuse or neglect one's own animals was an offense against morality and decency; to abuse someone else's animals was the destruction of property.

Bangor laws made the transition from destruction of property to crime against morality and decency earlier than the state. The 1829 by-laws quoted above cite concerns for morality as the primary reason to outlaw cruelty to animals. The measure, in fact, went on in some detail.

Whereas . . . the brute creatures aforesaid certainly are not less entitled to redress, because they are not able to complain, . . . it is ordered by the town that if any owner of any horse, mule or oxen, or if any person driving or using the same, shall unreasonably and cruelly beat or abuse such horse, mule or oxen, either while in the team, or when at liberty, such owner or other person shall forfeit and pay for each offence \$1.00 and it is further ordered by the town that if any person shall unreasonably load any horse, mule or oxen and shall endeavor by blows or otherwise, to force to carry or draw such loading when it is evident that they cannot, or can but with extreme difficulty, every such person, or persons, shall forfeit the sum of \$1.00.⁷

While the measures protected all "dumb animals," it provided special consideration for livestock, particularly horses and mules. Nineteenth-century New Englanders considered these animals so valuable that the law regarded this form of property as taxable, along with real estate, stocks, and bonds. By the 1860s, taxes on Bangor's livestock had become a major source of revenue. For example, Rueben Bagley paid taxes on two cows, twelve sheep, three yearlings, and two colts, all of which Bangor listed as taxable property, along with the family piano.⁸ The high value of livestock invariably led to special measures to ensure protection. As early as 1796, Bangor created public pens, or pounds, for stray livestock. If animals were injured while being held in municipal pounds, the

community could be held responsible. In 1857 James Bishop was awarded \$10.00 for injuries to his cow while the animal was in the municipal pound. By the 1850s the town required cattle and horses to wear identifying tags around their necks when they were grazing on public land. Previous methods included the seventeenth-century practice of nicking the animal's ears or branding.⁹

In the mid-nineteenth century, humane care of animals was considered not only morally right but practical. An 1856 article in the *Maine Farmer* noted:

Every correct farmer will study the comfort of every animal under his care—not only from a common point of humanity which is, or should be, instilled into him by the gentle and humanizing character of his pursuits—but from a healthy and laudable regard for his own interests. A facetious writer once said, “Misery never yet fattened any one and cold and hunger are miserable bed-fellows.” Good barns, comfortable shed, “cotes” for sheep and swine to go to when they please, are among the most elegant establishments of which a homestead in a rural district can possibly boast.¹⁰

Another article observed: “A good cow does her utmost to minister to our pleasure and profit, and deserves careful and good treatment. . . . He, therefore, who strikes a cow, or kicks a cow, or starves a cow, deserves the stick, the kick, and starvation.”¹¹

Bangor citizens perceived livestock as more than just property; their attitude indicated their recognition of animals as sentient beings. This is reflected in certain attitudes with respect to animal behavior. Nineteenth-century Maine residents expected certain minimal standards of correct behavior from their animals. One writer observed: “The farmer is the ‘schoolmaster’ of his herd. They are in the habit of doing daily as he allows them. They show training or the want of it. The cow, the horse, the ox and the dog are valued much according to their habits or education.” Local residents held that pigs were capable of taking on their owner's behavior. “There is a class of people who have so tamed their hogs that they will roam the streets nights, committing desperations [sic], stealing their living, and return[ing] to their pens before people are stirring.” This attitude led to some curiously worded municipal statutes. An 1854 ordinance dealt with “vagrant and lawless hogs.” Swine, like humans, presumably, were expected to obey ordinances.¹²

In spite of this legal concern for animal protection, Bangor enforced its anticruelty laws unevenly. In perhaps Bangor's first such case, in 1819,

the Supreme Judicial Court found Richard Garlin guilty of “malicious killing of cattle,” sentencing him to five days solitary imprisonment and two years hard labor in the state prison.¹³ The term “malicious killing” emphasized Garlin’s cruelty. In 1861, for example, a local court in New Hampshire found another man guilty of animal cruelty for severely beating his horse. He appealed on the grounds that the beating was not malicious but rather was necessary to train the horse. The court hearing the appeal concurred that “a beating for the purpose of training or discipline, although unreasonably severe,” did not violate the anticruelty law, as long as the beating administered was in good faith. This case established the precedent that animal cruelty involved acting in a “malicious” way.¹⁴

One set of practices that did receive the undivided attention of the municipal authorities was blood sports. As early as 1824 a local newspaper strongly condemned ox-bating. By 1856 Bangor had outlawed dog-fighting. On June 7, 1856, authorities arrested William Shaw, Thomas Murphy, and William Strange for conducting a dog fight in Brewer. The Police Court charged all three men with cruelty to animals. Shaw was released on one hundred dollars bond while Strange and Murphy were committed to jail. In 1873 Maine outlawed dog- and cock-fighting.¹⁵ Despite the best efforts of national animal welfare organizations, blood sports remained popular in many American cities well into the 1880s.

In October 1862 the Bangor Municipal Court prosecuted an “inhuman Scoundrel” for allegedly starving a horse after leaving the animal in a shed for four days without food or water.¹⁶ Although the outcome of this case is unknown, the fact that a court of law considered the case indicates that Bangor citizens were beginning to take their measures seriously.

In January 1869 Maine’s animal welfare movement underwent significant changes when Representative Charles B. Abbott of Glenburn proposed an amendment to the old anticruelty laws. Based on recent Massachusetts and New York animal anticruelty laws, he defined types of animal cruelty and removed the words “malicious” and “cruelty” from the statute. After the amendment passed, courts could prosecute citizens who, while acting in good faith, engaged in animal cruelty.¹⁷ Furthermore, the revised law, for the first time, held corporations liable for the mistreatment of animals. Railroad companies that transported livestock without providing adequate care were now considered accountable for the animals’ health and safety. Livestock carriers were forbidden to confine animals “in cars for a longer period than twenty-eight consecutive

hours, unless delayed by storm or accidental cause, without unloading for rest, water, and feeding for a period of five hours.”¹⁸

Also in 1869 citizens created the Bangor Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (BSPCA), with 136 members. One of the first such institutions in the state, the BSPCA was probably inspired by anticruelty societies already formed in New York and Massachusetts. Among the early members was Charles Abbot, the representative from Glenburn who had sponsored the anticruelty bill in the House. Unfortunately, five years after helping to launch the organization, Abbott died on March 8, 1874, at age sixty-nine.¹⁹

During the 1870s this society became well established as a protector of all animals. In 1875 members examined the horses and other animals connected with Howe’s and Cushing’s Circus and found them to be well fed and well cared for, something that was not always the case with traveling shows. The society also inspected cattle on trains and took possession of ill-treated horses. In 1872 a similar organization was established in Portland.²⁰

Increasingly in the second half of the century the animal welfare movement focused on horses, in particular urban workhorses. This



In the second half of the nineteenth century the animal welfare movement became increasingly concerned with the plight of urban work horses such as this one pictured on the streets of Bangor at the end of the century.

Collections of the Bangor Public Library.

creature increased dramatically in numbers during these years. Census records in Penobscot County indicate that between 1860 and 1890 the number of workhorses in the county rose from 6,846 to 13,946.²¹ These figures are reflected in rising concern for the treatment of urban workhorses. One newspaper article noted that the average horse deserved much more care and consideration than it was receiving.²² Joseph Carr, first president of the BSPCA, wrote: "The cruelty and abuse inflicted on the horses in our streets within the last month should be enough to arise the humanity and indignation of all those hearts which are not utterly callous."²³ Horses were beaten and overloaded, another article pointed out. Many of these cases involved individuals abandoning horses too old, too sick or too debilitated to continue working. In Belfast, for instance, "a fiendish act was perpetrated . . . by a brute in human form. . . . A drunken jockey cut the throat of his poor, old, worn-out horse and left the suffering animal to wander about the streets till he bled to death. Another individual in China, Maine was arrested and charged with "the dastardly crime of cutting the throat of a horse."²⁴

In Bangor such practices were prosecuted on a regular basis. In the first ten years after the establishment of the BSPCA, sixteen cases involving cruelty to animals made it into the Bangor Police Courts. In all but one of the cases the abused animal was a horse. The exception was a case in which Thomas Dean was convicted of neglecting four cattle while transporting them on a train. In at least one case, that involving Henry Berry, the details are known. On June 6, 1874, Berry attempted to deal with a "contrary" horse by wrapping a cord around its jaw and tongue. Unfortunately he wrapped the cord so tightly that he cut the animal's tongue off.²⁵

During these eleven years, there were no cases of abuse visited upon companion animals. This may reflect the belief that dogs and cats were not really worthy of such consideration. In one case in 1884 the Maine Supreme Court ruled that the dog was not truly a domestic animal and thus was not protected under the animal welfare laws. This ruling was overturned in 1899 when a court established that dogs were property and therefore protected by law. It would take a ruling by the Maine Supreme Court in 1915 to establish the cat as worthy of such consideration.²⁶

In 1882 the BSPCA was reorganized as the Bangor Humane Society. This name change may have reflected its new duties—the organization was now also concerned about the welfare of children. Its 1882 Constitution stated that "the object of this organization shall be the prevention of

cruelty to animals and children,” and in 1915 the organization changed its name to the Bangor Humane Society for the Protection of Animals and Children. Within a year, though, this ended, as child welfare became a concern of the state and of separate local organizations.²⁷

Child abuse and neglect were as common as animal abuse and neglect. Unlike animal welfare, prior to the late 1860s little had been done with respect to child welfare. Nineteenth-century municipal records contain numerous cases of newborn infants being thrown into rivers—or left outside to die of exposure. Such abuse was not confined to the very young; older children also suffered their share of abuse and neglect. Most abandoned children ended up at the local poor farm with the indigent, the sick, and the insane. An 1852 list of the residents at the Bangor Almshouse includes five children under the age of ten who were there without adult relatives.²⁸

In the late 1860s things began to improve. Abandoned children were removed from the environment that included criminals and the mentally ill and put in orphanages. On May 11, 1869, the Bangor Children’s Home opened its doors, and in 1871 a law was passed making the abandonment of children a crime.²⁹ By 1883 the Maine Legislature gave com-



The opening of the Bangor Children’s Home in 1869 illustrates the growing interest in the welfare of children at the end of the nineteenth century. Designed by Boston architect Henry W. Hartwell, the building still stands on Ohio street in Bangor.

Collections of the Bangor Historical Society.

munities the power to investigate cases of child abuse. The state remained reluctant to interpose in family matters, and even the Bangor Humane Society shied away from such intervention. In an early declaration, the society made it plain that it would not invade the family circle: "It may be deemed just to say that no improper or officious intermeddling with the rights of parents or guardians . . . will be attempted, but cases of cruelty resulting from intemperance, bad temper or neglect . . . will receive attention and be investigated by its officers."³⁰ Six years later the state passed a new measure making abuse, neglect, or extreme punishment of a child by a parent or guardian a crime punishable by imprisonment. By 1907 the state had established a new municipal officer, the "agent for the protection of children," thus establishing for the first time that child abuse was the responsibility of the state.³¹ Within a decade of this measure, animal and child welfare organizations had become separate entities.³²

As child welfare became part of the Bangor Humane Society agenda, the number of women in this organization increased dramatically. Early newspaper accounts indicate that it was founded entirely by men. However, between 1875 and 1882, the number of women affiliated with the organization increased from 10 to 88. At the same time the total number of members increased from 190 to 292.³³ The total number of men only increased from 180 to 204, a little more than 20% increase. At the same time the total number of women increased from 10 to 88—nearly a 900% increase. Equally important, in 1875 none of the officers were women; by 1882 there were eight women officers.

There were several reasons for the sharp rise in women members. At least twenty-two of the women were married to members. A number were widows of earlier members, and others may have been daughters or sisters of members. This was important enough to produce a ladies' auxiliary. Established in December 1874, it soon had fourteen members. A notice from June 1875 suggests active recruitment and fund-raising activities.³⁴ Still, relatives can not alone account for the dramatic increase in women. Another factor may have been the society's involvement in child welfare. Most of the early advocates of child welfare in Bangor were women. Of the thirty-one members of the Children's Home Society in 1879, only five were men and seven of the women were also members of the Bangor Humane Society.³⁵

Some of the women also became involved in humane education, which by 1900 had become part of the curriculum in the Bangor public schools. A work published in 1901 contains a series of lessons for the Pond Street School on the benefits of temperance. The eleventh lesson

deals with kindness to animals. The teacher and author, L. Mabel Freese, became a well-known author and poet as well as a pivotal force in the establishment of the Bangor YWCA.³⁶ Mixing equal parts rationality, compassion, and religion, Freese notes five reasons why children should be kind to animals:

- Because animals are so much like ourselves.
- Because they are so useful, and we are so dependent upon them.
- Because they are neglected for so many years, and have suffered so much at the hand of man.
- Because of the effect produced upon our characters by being kind, thoughtful and loving creatures.
- Because the Bible commands us to regard the lives of the beasts of the forest and the cattle upon a thousand hills and to consider the fowls of the air because they are the Heavenly Father's and He is good to all and His tender mercies are all over his works.

She also observes that kindness to animals is the mark of refinement: "Cruelty is the trait of a bully, kindness the mark of a gentleman."³⁷ Freese's efforts were not the only attempts at humane education in Bangor. Throughout the twentieth century the Humane Society gave periodic awards to school children for essays on kindness to animals.³⁸

In the 1920s Maine animal welfare organizations began to move in still another direction: away from the horse as the primary animal of interest. This was largely because of the advent of the automobile and the disappearance of the urban workhorse as a source of commercial transportation.³⁹ Changes in the Bangor Fire Department's expenditures recorded in the city's annual reports from 1921 to 1928 for both horses and automobiles reflect this new development:

Year	Expend. Horses	Expend. Autos.
1921	\$5,651.60	\$496.80
1922	\$4,382.98	\$1,746.76
1923	\$2,312.24	\$4,751.15
1924	\$1,120.59	\$1,896.07
1925	\$954.23	\$2,734.24
1926	\$689.90	\$4,498.84
1927	\$310.36	\$2,069.42
1928	0	\$2,197.27

As the horse disappeared from the urban landscape, animal welfare organizations turned their attention to two of the most prominent creatures in the human-animal relationship: the dog and the cat. Through-

out much of early Maine history, many people saw dogs mainly as killers of livestock and spreaders of rabies. While the rabies problem in nineteenth-century Maine was relatively minor, the problem of livestock killing was serious enough to require legislation. As early as 1821 the state passed measures to deal with "mischievous dogs," or dogs that worried, wounded, or killed livestock. Dog owners whose animals were found chasing livestock were given a warning. If the dog persisted they could be killed and the owners fined triple the value of the animals injured or killed by the canine felon. Despite this measure, livestock killing by dogs continued to be a problem; in time, some farmers became so exasperated with this situation that they suggested offering bounties for these animals.⁴⁰

As Maine became more urbanized and more commercialized, dogs took on a new role as companion animals. Nineteenth-century Portland and Bangor newspaper advertisements for lost dogs reflect this new estimation. In 1846 one individual ran a lost-dog advertisement for ten days.⁴¹ In every case a reward was offered for the return of the animal. The amount in one case was ten dollars making the animal, a King Charles Royal Spaniel, superior in value to an apprentice who ran away in 1840. (The individual to whom the boy was indentured offered only a one cent reward for his return.)⁴² There were numerous articles in mid-nineteenth-century Maine newspapers about devoted dogs, intelligent dogs, noble dogs, popular dogs, and even a discriminating dog. Dogs were not the only companion animals to come in for journalistic praise; there were also stories of cats exhibiting both intelligence and good taste.⁴³ Throughout much of the early nineteenth century, Maine cats served primarily as living mousetraps on seagoing vessels, a position they had held in English society since at least the thirteenth century.⁴⁴ Probably the most interesting result of this maritime relationship was the Maine coon cat, a product of many shipboard romances between English shorthaired and Persian ship's cats.⁴⁵

By the late 1920s dogs and cats made up the major portion of animal welfare concerns. In 1929 the Bangor Humane Society investigated cases involving 800 cats, 230 dogs, 34 horses, 4 doves, and 2 cows. The animal shelter took in 83 dogs and 9 cats, of which only 19 were destroyed. In 1940 this organization acquired a new ambulance designed specifically for the transport of sick and injured dogs and cats. By this time the emphasis was almost entirely on small animals. For example, in 1945 the Bangor Humane Society investigated 691 cases of suspected animal cruelty, only 18 of which involved livestock.⁴⁶



This image of a pampered pet, from an album of Hannibal Hamlin family photographs, depicts the new status that dogs acquired as companion animals in the nineteenth century.

Collections of the Bangor Public Library.

With the rise in concern for companion animals came a need for physical facilities to care for these creatures. One of the earliest in Maine was established by the Bangor Humane Society. The organization was well endowed for this period; between 1927 and 1934 a total of twenty-two individuals left in excess of fifty-five thousand dollars to the organization. In 1933 the society established an animal shelter on Howard Street in Bangor. There is some evidence that prior to 1933 there were unofficial animal shelters, one at 52 Cottage Street and another at 26 Elizabeth Street.

During much of the second half of the twentieth century the Bangor Humane Society was stable, largely due to the longevity of its leadership. From 1938 to 1985 the organization had just two presidents: Edward L. Gleszer and Robert Haskell. In addition, shelter managers enjoyed long tenures. First Edwin Crowell and then his son Ernest Crowell served in this capacity from 1931 to 1973.⁴⁷ This continuity did not mean the society stagnated. Contributions continued between 1927 and 1962, totalling \$182, 253; of this, \$119, 720 came from women.⁴⁸ In 1964 as a result of increased demands, the animal shelter moved from Howard Street to Mt.



By the turn of the century, cats as well as dogs, took on the role of much-loved family pet. The animal welfare movement shifted its attention almost entirely to these companion animals in the first decades of the twentieth century.

Collections of the Bangor Historical Society.

Hope Avenue. Within a decade the facility was once again insufficient, particularly since the Humane Society dealt not only with homeless dogs and cats but also with lost animals. As a result, in 1974 the society separated the lost animals from the homeless ones. In 1975 the city built a new municipal animal pound at a cost of \$35,000.00.⁴⁹

The 1980s brought new challenges to this organization: a dramatic increase in animal cruelty cases and staff problems. In 1995, however, the society received \$1.5 million to build a new shelter. This modern facility accepts and cares for between 7,000 and 10,000 animals annually. It runs an extremely progressive animal adoption program that emphasizes public health and population control.⁵⁰ Yet, for all this advancement the general beliefs have little changed from 1820s when Maine's people saw cruelty to animals as both an insult and a moral affront to civilized society.

The long history of animal welfare in Bangor officially begins with the incorporation of the city in 1834, when the city's first by-laws established cruelty to animals as a crime punishable by fine. The major concerns of these early years involved livestock, an important component of eastern Maine's economy. In 1869 the animal welfare movement achieved institutional status with the establishment of the Bangor Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. The organization's focus shifted away from livestock to workhorses. In 1882 this organization changed its name to the Bangor Humane Society, due to an interest in child welfare, and, at approximately the same time, the organization became popular with women. While there is no adequate explanation for this dramatic increase, possible reasons include association with male relatives or a desire to contribute actively to the betterment of children.

In the late 1920s the automobile began to replace the horse and, with the disappearance of this animal from the urban landscape, the interests of the Bangor Humane Society moved in the direction of companion animals—dogs and cats. By the 1930s the welfare of dogs and cats had become the major concern the Humane Society, as it remains today.

NOTES

1. *Laws of the State of Maine*, 1821, Chap. 4, Sec. 4.
2. Harriet Ritvo, *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), 2.
3. *Laws of the State of Maine*, 1821.
4. David Favre and Vivien Tsang, "The Development of Anti-Cruelty Laws during the 1800s," *Detroit College Law Review* (Spring 1993), 4, 8;

Brian Harrison, "Animals and the State in Nineteenth-Century England," *English Historical Review* 88 (October 1975): 788.

5. *Revised Statutes of the State of Maine, October 22, 1840*, Title 12, Chap. 160, Sect. 35 (hereafter *Revised Statutes*).

6. *Revised Statutes, 1840*, Title 12, Chap. 162, Sect. 1.

7. By-Laws of the Town of Bangor, 1829, in City Clerk's Records, 1819-1834, City Clerk's Office, Bangor (hereafter CCR).

8. Tax Returns, City of Bangor, 1864, Special Collections, Fogler Library, University of Maine, Orono.

9. Board of Aldermen, October 5, 1857, CCR, 1852-58; June 7, 1858, CCR, 1859-67; David Freeman Hawke, *Everyday Life in Early America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), 40.

10. *Maine Farmer*, January 3, 1856.

11. *Bangor Whig and Courier*, March 31, 1869.

12. *Aroostook Pioneer*, July 20, 1858; *Bangor Whig and Courier*, May 9, 1848; Board of Aldermen, May 1, 1854, CCR, 1852-1858.

13. *Bangor Weekly Register*, September 22, 1819.

14. *State v. Avery*, 44 NH 392; Favre and Tsang, "Development of Anti-Cruelty Laws," 8.

15. *Bangor Whig and Courier*, January 15, 1824; June 13, 1856; *Annual Reports, City of Bangor, 1856-57* (Bangor: Wheeler and Lynde, 1857), 61 (hereafter *Bangor City Reports*); *Acts and Resolves of the Fifty-Second Legislature of the State of Maine, 1873* (Augusta, 1873), Chap. 146.

16. *Bangor Whig and Courier*, October 27, 1862. See *Bangor City Records, 1862-63*, 69.

17. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, 1869* (Augusta, 1869), 64, 336, 346, 353; *Journal of the Senate of Maine, 1869* (Augusta, 1869), 71-72, 146, 335.

18. *Acts and Resolves of the Forty-Eighth Legislature of the State of Maine, 1869*, Chap. 73.

19. *Bangor Whig and Courier*, April 9, 17, 28, 1869; March 9, 1874. See also, March 30, April 6, 1869.

20. *Ibid.*, May 30, June 9, November 2, 1875; *Annual Report, The Maine State Society for the Protection of Animals, 1893* (Portland, 1893), 3.

21. *Reports upon Statistics of Agriculture compiled from Returns from the Eighth (1860), Ninth (1870), Tenth (1880) and Eleventh (1890) Censuses of the United States* (Washington, 1861-1893).

22. *Maine Farmer*, July 30, 1868.

23. *Bangor Whig and Courier*, April 6, 1869. See "Miscellaneous Papers, Bangor Humane Society," in *Journals of John Edwards Godfrey* (Rockland, Maine: Courier-Gazette, Inc. 1979), 1: 365.

24. *Maine Farmer*, April 17, October 23, 1869; *Belfast Progressive Age*, October 19, 1871.

25. Cases are documented in the *Bangor Whig and Courier*. For Berry case see June 6, 1874.

26. *State v. Harriman*, 75 ME 562 (1884); *Chapman v. Decrow*, 93 ME 379 (1899); *Thurston v. Carter*, 112 ME 361 (1915).

27. Though officially created in 1882, the Bangor Humane Society was not incorporated until 1919. See *Bangor Daily News*, December 6, 1919; *Annual Report of the Bangor Humane Society for the Prevention of Cruelty* (Bangor: Benjamin A. Burr, 1882), 2; *Bangor Daily Commercial*, April 25, 1930.

28. *Bangor Whig and Courier*, May 18, 1837, March 31, 1852, October 2, 1854, May 31, 1870, June 1, 8, and November 20, 1875, January 18, 1882; *Eastern Argus*, July 29, 1836, January 16, 1869.

29. *Bangor Whig and Courier*, May 1, 1869; *Revised Statutes of the State of Maine, Passed January 25, 1871* (Portland, 1871), Title 11, Chap. 118, Sec. 20.

30. *Bangor Whig and Courier*, February 4, 1882.

31. *Acts and Resolves of the Sixty-Fourth Legislature of the State of Maine, 1889* (Augusta, 1889), Chap. 59, Sec. 150; *Acts and Resolves of the Seventy-Third Legislature of the State of Maine, 1907* (Augusta, 1907), Chap. 43.

32. *Bangor Daily Commercial*, April 25, 1930.

33. A recent article in the *Bangor Daily News* (June 18, 1997) noted incorrectly that “the Bangor Humane Society was founded in 1869 by a group of concerned women who dedicated themselves to preventing cruelty initially in farm animals, then companion animals and children.”

34. *Bangor Whig and Courier*, June 3, 1874, September 1, 1875.

35. *Annual Report of the Children’s Home, Bangor, Me., January 7, 1879*. (Bangor, 1879), 1.

36. L. Mabel Freese, *Temperance Helps for Primary Teachers* (Chicago: Woman’s Temperance Publishing Association, 1901), 83-101; “Obituary. Mabel F. Dennett,” *Bangor Daily News*, June 10, 1950.

37. Freese, *Temperance*, 84.

38. *Bangor Daily News*, February 6, 1935, April 23, 1941.

39. Clay McShane, *Down the Asphalt Path: American Cities and the Automobile* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 190-191.

40. *Laws of the State of Maine, 1821*, Chap. 174, Secs. 1-5; *Maine Farmer*, July 17, 1869.

41. *Bangor Whig and Courier*, August 15-24, 1846, April 3, 1848, August 14, 1862, November 12, 1866.

42. *Maine Farmer*, May 2, 1840; *Bangor Whig and Courier*, December 23, 1872.

43. *Maine Farmer*, May 22, 1845, January 16, 1869; *Eastern Argus*, May 12, 1848, December 2, 1850; *Bangor Weekly Register*, July 19, 1817; *Bangor Whig and Courier*, July 4, 1846, December 3, 1857, June 22, 1869, February 13, 1882.

44. David C. Douglas, ed. *English Historical Documents, 1189-1327* (Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1975), 3: 980; *Bangor Weekly Register*, February 24, 1825.

45. Marilis Hornidge, *That Yankee Cat: The Maine Coon*, rev. ed. (Gardiner, Maine: Tilbury House, 1991); *Bangor Daily Commercial*, December 12, 1949.

46. *Bangor Daily Commercial*, February 6, 1929; *Bangor Daily News*, March 13, 1940, February 7, 1945.

47. *Bangor Daily News*, February 2, 1938, June 23, October 2, November 16, 1961, September 4, 1973.

48. "Bangor Humane Society—Bequests to May 1, 1962," "Bangor Humane Society: Brief Resume of Its History and Activities," Miscellaneous Papers, Bangor Humane Society; *Bangor Daily News*, February 6, 1935.

49. *Bangor Daily News*, April 1, October 31-November 1, 1964, December 31, 1973; City of Bangor, *Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year ending December 31, 1974* (Bangor, 1974), 15.

50. *Bangor Daily News*, December 31, 1980, January 31, 1981. March 9, 1989, August 17, 1995, June 18, 1997.