

I was disturbed to later learn that, although Ms. Buchanan's fines were in the neighborhood of \$120.00, she was made to pay ONLY \$50!!! Now that begs the question! It completely overwhelms me!!! She has trampled on the Animal Control Laws with impunity and is made to pay a watered-down fine, and we call this justice??? This is laughable! What am I breaking my back for? No wonder these laws - and others - are flaunted.

I have expended much time and effort to go to court against this party and now I must wait for a summons to be issued (she did not make an appearance for a hearing on Wednesday, 7 January 1981), then a warrant and perhaps months may past before there is action. Perhaps not. At the hearing, City Councillor, Walter J. Sullivan agreed to and did appear in person in my behalf. I am grateful. I am also grateful to others of the City Council - in fact to all of them - who listened to me. They all stand behind me. [I hope City Councillor Alfred Vellucci's problem with the great dane has had a positive outcome. A needless tragedy!]

I have a 27 January 1981 summons date on the 13th Floor instituting removal of the Buchanan dog. Given the overriding facts [aforementioned], the laws must be brought to bear on this individual. Will they be? I leave it to this capable body [the City Council] to answer.

II

On the same Wednesday, 7 January 1981, I was brought to the hearing in the Animal Control Van which van by all standards, in its present condition, is a most dangerous menace on the highway. If the Registry of Motor Vehicle ever inspected it, it would be considered an "outlaw" on the road, and the occupants arrested, fined, and incarcerated for endangering the lives of their fellow man as well as themselves. The present truck

1. has no protecting screen between the dog officers and animals placed in the truck;
2. is constantly broken down, leaving the city unattended;
3. has no right vent window (I am thankful it wasn't a cold day; I can see why the dog officers tend to have frequent colds);
4. on the passenger side, the door will not open from the inside;
5. has a sliding door that is inoperative - it doesn't open;
6. has numerous dents and body rot;
7. has bad brakes (the dog officer must nearly put his foot through the floor to brake the truck;
8. no protection to the dog officers when animals defecate in van. They must "live" with it;
9. has the rear end broken, producing constant noise which interferes with listening to the radio, and speech is almost impossible;
10. [An eight-hour day in that vehicle is extremely harmful to individual hearing, concentration, and just plain deteriorative to the officers].

Tel.: 491-8364
RECEIVED BY
OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

8 January 1981
310 Harvard Street
Cambridge, MA 02139

JAN 12 4 40 PM '81

Mayor Francis H. Duehay
26 Lowell Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dear Mayor Duehay:

These are troublous —indeed, perilous— times, especially when the health and welfare of Cambridge Citizens continues to come under attack by animal lovers/ owners who flagrantly violate the Animal Control Laws; by persons who care not a wit about their fellowman and continue to trench on the exercise of a fundamental right: The Fundamental Right to Travel (under the penumbra of the Constitution of the United States) — whether by conveyance or on foot — IN A PUBLIC PLACE (the sidewalk) where people have a right to be, and a right not to be abused: abused by defecated matter and animals let on the loose.

Justice screams "Listen to me!!!" The public seems calloused or tend to lack interest. I know this is not the attitude of our City Council. As a private citizen, I have worked tirelessly for the implementation and vigorous enforcement of the Animal Control Laws. Without such vigorous enforcement———.

It has come to my attention that enforcement of fines, the serving of warrants and summons, can only be carried out by the Police. Given the fact that the Police have more than enough to do with arresting and taking care of the seamy side of society, it seems the part of wisdom and justice as fairness to bring the entire operations relating to animals under the aegis and direction of the Animal Commission, with enforcement by the dog officers. They are the ones constantly on the firing lines — in the "heat of the battle." The Police, I submit, don't need this additional burden. Violators would be fined and made to pay those fines. Incurables would be summoned, arrested and made to pay fines plus interest from the day of serving of fines to the day of payment at the prime rate. What are the legal apparati — ordinances — needed to bring about mandatory change?

I say this because warrants and fines outstanding for over six months against a most incorrigible violator — one Donalda Buchanan of 307 Harvard Street (directly across from my house, and which person has inflicted much mental suffering on me and others) — were not served or paid for until City Manager James L. Sullivan was kind — and patient — enough to lend his ears to my complaint against her, on Friday, 2 January 1981. Ms. Buchanan is the owner of a vicious and nuisance great dane that has bitten other dogs and chased and terrified both children and adults (which occasions I witnessed). Chapter 140, Section 157, I am told, regarding vicious dogs is informative. City Manager Sullivan, immediately called the Acting Chief of Police, Mr. Paolillo, whereby arrest and payment of fines were made on Monday, 5 January 1981. I humbly, thank him.

8 January 1981

To say we need new vehicles — and fast — must be understood. I still don't believe I rode in that truck!!

Number 11, on the list was the one that most startled me:

11. Transmission broken!!! There is no park or neutral operation to the truck. The Truck starts in reverse and constantly JUMPS OUT OF GEAR.

The need for a proper ANIMAL CONTROL VEHICLE is imminent. Winter is still ahead! There is no other way the dog officers can do their jobs efficiently. Further delay, is criminal.

There is also a Mr. Edward Hines of Public Works who has statistical data regarding the purchase of new vans that have never been looked into, so I have been informed. The cost would be less than that appropriated by the City: \$12,000 per vehicle. Funds were already appropriated by Council unanimously, and it will be noted that over a period of four years, said sum was appropriated each year for vehicle and maintenance. I believe the years are from 1976-1979. Mr. Hines' route may be the way to go, to save taxpayer dollars. But I am sure Council will come up with the right decision and legal apparatus to effect immediate and mandatory changes.

What more can I say, but that words fail me;

What more can I do?

An earthly power doth then show likest God's when mercy
(on the Citizens of Cambridge) seasons justice (as implemented
by the Cambridge City Council).

Respectfully yours,

Miss Marjorie L. Francis
Miss Marjorie L. Francis

MLF/mlf

P.S. The City appropriated funds of \$12,000 per vehicle. Mr. Hines' cost would be less. I believe the funds were \$24,000 for two (2) vans.

6.

46

Comm. from Marjorie L. Francis, 310 Harvard Street, complaining of various dog matters in the city.

In City Council,

January 19, 1981

*Referred to C. Mgr
copy sent to C. Mgr
1/20/81 (dl)*

RECEIVED BY
OFFICE OF CITY CLERK

JAN 12 4 40 PM '81

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.