

DANGEROUS DOGS AND ANIMAL EXTREMISTS

August 25, 2008 · No Comments

<http://petdefense.wordpress.com/category/ab1634-ca/>

Doggiedefenders.com [see Shelter dogs navi tab on that site] which has a lot of information, shows us this study which is not often talked about, but should be part/parcel of every pet advocate's knowledge. This information clearly shows that animals surrendered are approx. 50% re-homed or stray/abandoned. A stray dog was previously owned in some form, or was abandoned; therefore it is fairly logical to assume abandonment in many cases was likely purposeful. [Except for those impounds (seized from owner)-- the stray and surrendered dogs could probably be lumped into 're-homed' category. I suppose technically, almost every adopted dog may qualify as 're-homed.']

Not amazingly, ONLY 2.5% came from pet stores -and likely that would be to health issues rather than aggression issues. Only 3.9% came from litters produced in the home. Nearly 41% of surrendered dogs were obtained FREE from the previous owner. In summary, the dogs most likely to end up in a shelter are those obtained at the lowest cost (\$100 or less) or free, are mixed medium sized breeds, male juvenile re-homed/or shelter dogs-not pet store dogs, nor home raised pets.

Obviously, this shows that logically we do not find champion, purebred, highly sought after, or expensive small 3lb dogs from pet stores, or even dogs which are allegedly sold on retail market for \$400-\$900 - in the SHELTERS as a general rule. But to hear EXTREMISTS tell the story, all of the shelter dogs came from dog "breeders." Of course, there is and never will be proof of this, not in California anyway. When such dogs DO enter the shelters, they usually hold auctions and the dog will go to the highest bidder. [This is so clear, the so-called "rescue" which only rescues "Bichons", admitted there were NO Bichons needing rescue. They then decided to buy puppy-milled dogs at auction and sell them as rescue dogs, which they do right now, and make more than \$500,000+ a year; see post on this site 6/11/08-NOW who's fooling who?]

Continuing on the shelter study-41% were surrendered for excess barking; 24% chewing; 45% hyperactivity, 21% house training accidents; <8% for aggression to other pets, <9% aggression to people. Under just these findings, it would appear that the chance of an aggressive dog even entering the shelter (via surrender) is rather remote. But since it would not be known what percent of the stray and impounded were actually aggressive, it's probably safe to say that it would exceed 5%, which would then approximate 9% (surrender) +5% (stray) + 8% (if you want to count pet aggressive), about 22%, or maybe 15% without the pet aggressive.

However, since the media likes to keep pushing dangerous dogs, just how did more than 50% of the FATAL ATTACKS involve re-homed (like craigslist), rescued, and shelter animals? The common thread in Craigslist, rescued, re-homed and shelter animals is ANIMAL EXTREMIST PEOPLE. For example, where a puppy had acid poured on it, but it wasn't the owner; it was people who HATE certain breeds of dogs, and want them all altered or killed off.

If you try and post a puppy on Craigslist, it will be flagged off; same for small breed, small white dogs, purebred dogs, breeder sales, sales of a dog, or even if someone THINKS someone has a dog to place which MIGHT be a "breeder" dog. People that post on Craigslist know that ARs run the Pet Boards, and as I have stated, just try it yourself and see if your ad is taken down. Usually mine are flagged within 20 minutes. Why? Because there are more than several groups of FLAGGER AR GROUPS-one of which is in San Francisco. And PRIOR to SF Craigslist making the "RULE" about NO selling or breeding of animals on Pet Boards section, groups like Bad Rap and other rescue groups out of the Bay area were getting together and claiming that dangerous dogs were being sold on Craigslist. (How they could prove this seems impossible to me) Anyway, see this post:

"Gang Flaggers are a big problem on craigslist, This is a self-appointed group of pet ad police who try to impose their personal agendas on us by posting pet ads they don't like in the hidden craigslist forum, then flag them (remove) out of existence. Here is just one example of the arrogance that you will find from the Gang-Flaggers in the 2626 forum:

"I've been able to flag MANY ads while being here today. . . . (VoiceoftheTOU 08/17 14:16:54) ... You don't affect me. I've hit almost every major craigslist location on the upper seaboard. Now I will work on the smaller locations. You have not and cannot staunch the flagging [flow.http://sfbay.craigslist.org/forums/?ID=99090475](http://sfbay.craigslist.org/forums/?ID=99090475) "

The main pet flagging forum is at <http://sfbay.craigslist.org/forums/?forumID=2626> and it is there you will find the group of "Gang Flaggers" who post hundreds of our pet ads a day, Flag them to be deleted, then post "GONE" when they see that the ad has been deleted.

The reasons given as justification for flagging an ad are often bizarre: "this ad is crap FLAG IT", "we don't need any more mutts ", "enough damn pits ", "AKC should be illegal", "government should force ppl to fix pets ", and so on.

If you know a lot about rescuing, rescued dogs, the types of people in rescue and the problems in shelters, then it won't come as a surprise to learn that questionable dogs are released from shelters (in CA) to rescuers which believe they can reasonably achieve rehabilitation with

certain animals. And as the case in point that I have on this site, (Rescuer Mauled by Rescue Dog) it is obvious that this is not just one isolated case. I have SEEN the dogs that have been pulled for rescue, and believe me, I would never have taken such poor specimens- many of them are fear biters, have too many issues with aggression based on fear, have issues with people, have no socialization which makes them a problem for kids, and have already bitten.

It is my understanding that many dogs with fear aggression cannot be or cannot be easily, rehabilitated. In any event, as has always been stated in the "media"- most owners claim that their dogs which bit people had `never shown´ aggression prior. While I personally doubt this (since the owners don´t appear to have much knowledge of canines, otherwise the situation probably wouldn´t have happened) - it is very likely that when obtaining a "re-homed" dog, most people don´t know the bad traits until down the road. And weeding those dogs out at the shelter is their job-and that´s another problem.

Half the people or maybe all of them in shelters, don´t have any professional experience in diagnosing behavioral issues which could kill people. And again, not surprisingly, in a trial in the Bay area re an AKC dog allegedly biting (it was proven there was no evidence the AKC dog actually bit)-out of the 18 prospective jurors-**EVERY SINGLE ONE KNEW SOMEONE WHO HAD BEEN BITTEN, OR HAD BEEN BITTEN BY A DOG THEMSELVES.** When queried whether the dog (either their dog or the person who was bit by a dog) was "re-homed" or "rescued", **EVERY SINGLE PERSON ADMITTED THE DOG HAD BEEN RESCUED.** Now those are NOT good odds!! So maybe in keeping with the animal extremist tactics, I should tell everyone that you have a 50% (or higher) greater chance of being killed or attacked by a re-homed, rescue, or shelter dog??!!

A dog that has already bitten? I was just told by a very well known blogger (1,500-2,000 hits/day+) that she/her daughter went to the local SPCA back East, they took a dog for a walk. They were not told that the dog had previously bitten several times. When the daughter bent down to pet the dog, the dog attempted to bite her. The daughter is not a child, she is an adult. Only then did the shelter worker tell them that the dog had already bitten or tried to bite at least 2-3 other times!!

Is this the way to put out dogs for adoption? Should biting dogs even be adopted out to rescues? I don´t think it´s a wise idea. Even the Dobie that was sent to the shelter for euthanization by owner was actually adopted OUT from the shelter to the public via Petfinder, it found a new owner and then what? It killed the new owner!

Is this what should be happening? I can´t overemphasize that the near impossibility of having over 50% of fatal attacks involving rescued, re-homed, or shelter dogs--indicates to me that **EXTREMISTS**

ARE INVOLVED WITH THIS BY PLACING DANGEROUS DOGS INTO SOCIETY ON PURPOSE.

Since the AR movement is nothing but a bunch of LIES and misrepresentations, I would be willing to bet that a direct LINK can be shown between the so-called dangerous dogs, and animal extremists.

If they will go so far as to place a known biting dog, and even try and adopt them out (unless the dog tries to kill rescuer first, as mentioned)-then it's extremely possible and plausible that extremists want THEIR crappy dogs on Craigslist, Petfinder and the like-to get OUT into society-and if and when someone gets hurt, not only are they GLAD-they are thrilled! Why?

Because it supremely SERVES their purpose of ENDING ownership of dogs, it lets them keep control at the shelters, rescues, Craigslist and the like; it enables them to say SEE-you people didn't take care of that dog right!! You people didn't listen when we told you that was a biting dog! You people should not OWN a dog!! Because if people were allowed to buy and select the well tempered dogs that might be available, THAT does NOT serve their purpose-which is WHY they DON'T want people buying any dogs.

If people BUY good dogs- they likely would not want the questionable dogs in any event. So to make it appear as if the dogs in shelters are the best in the land, they have to operate using either a guilt trip, a one-upmanship type deal, or just plain blatant browbeating. DON'T BREED OR BUY WHILE SHELTER ANIMALS DIE. LET US (PETA) KILL THEM + DUMP THEM, BUT THE PUBLIC SHOULD LISTEN TO US, AND GO ADOPT!!! Who the hell would EVER EVER BELIEVE that kind of CRAP????

I realize not every shelter dog is bad, as I have taken quite a few dogs out of shelters for rescue. However, I have personally seen the bad dogs taken out of shelters, and they kept pulling them until they had almost 100 of them which then caused quite a bit of problems. They were cited for sub standard premises, dogs were killing each other, and a host of other problems. (No, they were not pitbulls.) Many of them were mixed breed herding dogs. This was not a hoarding situation, (although I am sure some will say it was)- this was a rescue that pulled bad dogs from shelters. If they were not adopted (and they weren't) then many of them were scheduled to be killed by the SPCA. As we can see, it just doesn't serve a good purpose to pull bad dogs. Rescue or no rescue.

Categories: AB1634-CA · AR No Breed · AR No breeding No Buying · AR Truth-Tell People! · AR propaganda · Animal Planet · Animal Rights Hidden Agenda · Craigslist · MSN-The AR Pitch, PeTa's No Birth Nation ABC Rule for D · No Buy · No kill · Rescue Rehomed Shelter 50%+ of canine Fatal attacks · animal control · dog rescue · milled dogs · pEtA · rescued dogs

Tagged: animal extremist rescuers, dangerous dogs, ext, re homed dogs, rescued dogs,shelter dogs

NEW: AB1634 DEFEATED!!! KILLING MORE PETS IS NOT THE ANSWER!

August 22, 2008 · 2 Comments

Yes it's true, AB1634, the loser bill attempted by AR extremists to mandatorily alter every single dog/cat in the State of California has been soundly DEFEATED. It appears the vote was 27 NO to 5 YES. Even though `reconsideration` was allowed for Senators to change their mind, the truth is it will not happen.

Thus after a very long, hard battle, the people of California have spoken out against extremists with their insane agenda to stop pet ownership and the breeding of any worthwhile dogs and cats. The mandated, expensive program would have resulted in poor people's pets being abandoned and killed by the shelters, creating more killings in shelters- as the forced microchipping, impound fees, higher fines and surgery fees- could easily be \$600+-not affordable for many owners.

In my opinion, PETPAC was instrumental in staying the course of AB1634, and with the support of many, many owners, clubs, kennels, sporting dog, working dog, service dog, show dog, dog fanciers, cat fanciers, business owners in pet related areas, individuals, communities, web sites devoted to opposition of AB1634--everyone pulled together to help defeat one of the worst proposed laws ever against pets! <http://www.petpac.net> Join PETPAC, there is no charge to be a member! Now you know why nearly 50,000 people have joined!

Congratulations especially to Bill Hemby, Chairman and Lobbyist for PETPAC, and to all the unpaid volunteer workers who helped the cause. There is no better WIN than in knowing you did it the right way, simply by showing the TRUTH, and not with underhanded, false evidence, misleading "graphs" with phony results, or LIES -all of which are the tactics of ARs.

Good work everyone!!!!

Categories: AB1634-CA · AR No Breed · AR No breeding No Buying · AR Truth-Tell People! · AR propaganda · Animal Rights Hidden Agenda · Dog owner Rights · MSN · MSN-The AR Pitch, PeTa's No Birth Nation ABC Rule for D · No Buy · No kill · Rescue Rehomed Shelter 50%+ of canine Fatal attacks · animal control · dog rescue · pEtA · rescued dogs

Tagged: AB1634, AB1634 2008, animal extremist legislation

NEW: LA CITY `MSN` A PREDICTED FAILURE-"NO" ENFORCEMENT NOW?
August 21, 2008 · No Comments

WELL... First it was that Los Angeles' MSN which passed in FEBRUARY 2008-was an absolute MUST for LA city. Which "would have started" in October 2008. They previously passed the same dumb type ordinance

for the county (which I seriously doubt is working at all).. NOW suddenly after AB1634 has FAILED-we have the city controller saying this:

1. AC is "ill-equipped" to ENFORCE the ordinance. DUH?

Excuse me, but were they E-V-E-R EQUIPPED to ENFORCE it when you passed it? Could they EVER ENFORCE IT? Do they have 1,000 AC officers? I thought not. Because that's about how many you would have to TRY to enforce it. Maybe they can't count. Or listen to reasonable minds.

2. There has been no public education of the "NEW LAW".

What were the `educators' doing since February when it passed? Was there not a budget problem in February 2008? (YES) Did your LA activists/extremists not say that they would turn the LA shelters into NO KILL and they harrassed and threw smoke bombs and more to get the shelters into compliance? And did LA not spend millions expanding Boks' shelter kennels and hiring more people/buying more vehicles?

3. There is no money to "ENFORCE" THE LAW.

Exactly WHAT THE HECK did pet advocates say in opposition to the ordinance that admittedly now "cannot be enforced?" Did they not collectively say:

1) You cannot enforce it 2) You will end up killing more animals 3) It doesn't affect feral cats 4) Punitive laws do not work on social welfare problems like this 5) INCREASED costs of at least 300% would transpire 6) Dog licensing drops off 7) Shelter killing goes up due to impounds/non redemption 8) Has been a total failure in 95% of cases attempted in the past 9) CVMA is against the ordinance 10) Pet advocates are against the ordinance, as well as owners/breeders/service +working dog owners/breeders, and just about all of the public that isn't an AR nut case.

Further, in one news article on 8/21, it stated the ordinance would only be enforced against intact animals encountered in the course of business; then in another article on 8/22, it stated that "Though animal services is charged with enforcing the MSN, it does NOT intend to do so"...that came from the city controller.

What I see is the fact that in AB1634's repeated LIES, misrepresentations, and deceitful marketing--all of them failures by the ARs- and the ARs attempts to harass shelter workers and use smoke bombs and unpopular demonstrations leading to property destruction- the City only passed the ordinance to pacify the extremists. But now that AB1634 isn't going anywhere, they are out still there in shelter

land trying to do NO KILL with NO success-without sufficient rescue volunteers, without sufficient fosters-without sufficient low/free TARGETED altering for low income families' pets. (NOT amazingly-these dire circumstances WERE ALREADY KNOWN IN 2005!!) There is so much to be said about this that I will have to construct a specific AR Insanity Tactics post.

Despite what one may read online and in books, NO KILL does NOT happen overnight in a huge city-it is simply impossible due to the staggering numbers. There is an approx. average of 1,000+ animals coming in per week. It could be done over time, but certainly not quickly. And by that I mean we are looking at years. Even if they were lucky and had the funding, it would still be very difficult. The programs that work are usually implemented by organized groups with many volunteers, many dedicated workers, and the procedures to carry these tasks to completion. They usually work with private SPCA groups.

Within the plans to ramp up for NO KILL or even aggressive targeted pet altering- nearly all resources should be FOCUSED and targeted on: 1) low income families 2) Underserved areas/citizens 3) Marketing to #1+#2 and 4) Additional Fund Raising Usually all this is done by a 501(c)(3) tax exempt organization. In my opinion I would target the highest kill shelter which in this case, are the shelters under Boks' control. However they perhaps should have started with only 1/2 of them, since there are six-eight separate shelters under Boks if I remember correctly, holding about 1055 kennels.

The evidence shows that in 2003, the city aimed to be no kill by 2008. It is now 2008 and obviously that goal has not been realized. The Executive Summary of 2005 indicated that 85% of cats killed were KITTEnS. Pups allegedly accounted for 45% of the killed canines. (I seriously doubt this but they probably counted dogs of 1 yr as a pup) It also stated that cats, pitbull types and German Shepherds were 60% of the animals killed. It was admitted that altering programs did NOT address the feral cat population. *(AB1634 did not affect feral cats and neither does MSN. since cats are accounting for most of the killing-with dog killing having dropped 50%-why use unenforceable MSN when it won't affect the killing rate of any cats???)

The number of cats killed 2001-2005 remained steady, but dog killing dropped by more than 50%. They also had problems with finding vets for the mobile spay units (not paid enough) and the relationship with local humane groups was not good. (In part, due to the ARs smoke bombing, shelter workers fired, quitting; constant fracas and demonstrations by ADL Los Angeles, a militant animal rights group; the Executive Summary of 2005, specifically mentions the hostility from ARs-personal threats to AC staff and vandalism of private homes-damaging the already low morale and motivation.)

I noted one recommendation was to obtain a "second" mobile spay unit. That is way way off base. They would need either a complete animal hospital, or about 5-7 mobile units. Or both. [Bad legislation and MISREPRESENTATION is ALREADY prolific w/AR groups--I am working on a piece for that]

South LA, a mostly Hispanic area was named as an 'overwhelming' area. They could have concentrated the mobile units only in that area for several months, utilized bilingual marketing materials, and arranged for volunteers to round up the pets/owners. I seriously doubt they did anything of the sort. Based on population projections, there will be more minority citizens (includes Hispanic population) than white citizens in perhaps 15-20 years. If that is the case. LA is nothing but a big time bomb when it comes to arresting the uncontrolled animal population in this area.

Categories: AB1634-CA · Los Angeles ARs · MSN · animal control · dog rescue · rescued dogs

DOG FANCY MAGAZINE sets Record Straight-PETA on Fraudulent Ad August 20, 2008 · 2 Comments

Dog Fancy magazine unknowingly published a classified ad for a free puppy pak, BUT the actual free item did not exist-**INSTEAD** the toll free number went directly to a PETA directive!! (See below) Many outraged readers wanted nothing more to do with Dog Fancy. The information spread like wildfire over the Internet.

So in October issue of Dog Fancy, the editor Susan Chaney devotes an entire FULL PAGE on pg. 8, not only apologizing for the error-but also prints the admission, AND TRUTH- that PeTa and HSUS are trying to take away pet owners' rights.

THANK YOU DOG FANCY FOR FINALLY STANDING UP TO WHAT HAS BEEN A LONG-KNOWN FACT, AND MAY THE PUBLIC BEWARE-ANIMAL EXTREMISTS WANT 'NO PETS TO BE OWNED.'

I have to give Dog Fancy magazine credit for doing this, (even though it took several months)-as the AKC has decided to NOT further contest AB1634 re MSN and mandated "microchipping"-hey-could it have anything to do with AKC being part and parcel of the AKC COMPANION ANIMAL RECOVERY MICROCHIPPING that AKC runs? They don't do it for free. OOPS, AR Levine has now (8/21/08) changed or attempted to change AB1634 again-and NOW AKC says they oppose AB1634 because they "don't" trust Levine. You can never trust ARs, so why bother?

According to a "veghead" posting this is the explanation-

The classified ad contains a phone number for owners of new purebred puppies to call to receive a "free gift bag". There aren't any

toys or pet food samples to be had, however: the number offers callers a "body bag" to represent the shelter pet killed when people choose breeder or pet store animals. From the PETA press release on the issue:

The recorded message explains the hard facts to callers: Buying a puppy means that a dog in an animal shelter loses the chance for adoption, which means that one more dog will be needlessly destroyed. Callers are also told to practice their ABCs-animal birth control-by getting their new dog "fixed" to avoid adding further to the canine overpopulation crisis. Callers are encouraged to adopt, not buy, their next canine companion. The ad is the latest salvo in PETA's national ABC campaign.

Here a few quotes from the apology by Dog Fancy, I apologize for not being able to upload it in a readable format:

..." We apologize to all who have been offended by PeTa's offensive and misleading stunt" "But numerous organizations such as PeTa would like to take our rights away from us" "We can't support organizations that think the solution to the problem is to legally force all dog owners to give up their rights" We don't believe the government, whether it be city, township, county, state, or federal, should force you to have any surgical procedure done on your pets..nor to have them microchipped if you choose another form of ID" "Nor to say you can't breed a purebred dog if you truly feel it's the right thing to do" "PeTa , HSUS and others spend millions annually to promote LEGISLATION that will take away dog owners' rights..."

ALL OF US know that PeTa is nothing but a sham organization dedicated to allegedly "saving" animals-but the truth is- they don't save any animals. Especially not dogs or cats. In fact they would rather KILL them than have PEOPLE own them. And they have continued to do so. Let's face it, ARs have to use SUBTERFUGE because the public is TIRED and getting WISE to their BS.

So when PeTa rants about "needlessly" dying shelter animals, that is a complete misrepresentation and fabrication- since needless indicates that "because" a person bought a dog, a shelter animal died. Or in other words, IF the owner had NOT bought a dog, the shelter animal would LIVE? Be serious. That is the absolute most idiotic thing I have ever heard and it gripes me to hear such stupidity over and over.

That one sentence ALONE shows how absolutely insane AR people can be. Like they even care about any shelter animals. BIGGEST LIE OF THE CENTURY. Now if they just admitted that their REAL goal is to just USE animals in order to achieve their goal of NO ONE owning them-that would at least be the TRUTH. Instead--they have continued to lie,

manipulate, and employ every KNOWN tactic ever invented-nothing is too scum bag for them, nothing is off limits, nothing is too LOW. I see it as prostitution of animals, and nothing more. One doesn't turn a whore into a queen by calling her a different NAME. And PETA-don't ask what kind of fur is used for the doggie doorbell in the picture because frankly, it's none of your business.

Categories: AB1634-CA · AR Harassment · AR No Breed · AR No breeding No Buying · AR Truth-Tell People! · AR propaganda · Animal Planet · Animal Rights Hidden Agenda · Constitutional Issues · Craigslist · Dog breed bans · Dog owner Rights · HSUS · Los Angeles ARs · MSN · MSN-The AR Pitch, PeTa's No Birth Nation ABC Rule for D · No Buy · No kill · Rational Basis · SB861 · dog rescue · pEtA · political BSL · rescued dogs

Tagged: Add new tag, MSN, pEtA, BSL, Peta fraud ad, HSUS, Dog Fancy magazine apology re Peta, Dog Fancy magazine apology, Lies told by ARs

AB1634: Take Poor People's pets+INCREASE Shelter Killing now??
August 16, 2008 · No Comments

See prior video from June 25, 2008 from Sacramento, CA legislative hearing on AB1634, right before the provision for "unverified" complaints was taken out because of due process concerns. (Go down to RED Instructions below)

<http://www.petconnection.com/blog/2008/08/14/veterinary-experts-vs-retired-game-show-host-hello/>

(Below is Pet Connection article, condensed, re updated AB1634)
re MSN issues-and experts saying MSN is NOT a one-fit-all- solution.

BY GINA SPADAFORI

August 14, 2008

Chances are you've never heard of a veterinary theriogenologist - a specialist in the reproductive systems of animals. (Kinda like a veterinary ob/gyn.) These experts - many of whom teach at the top veterinary schools in the country - have come out with a position statement against forced spay-neuter:

[...] While there are health benefits to spaying and neutering these must be weighed against the health benefits of the sex steroids. In general ...

"On the other hand, the disadvantages of spaying or neutering may include increased risk of obesity, diabetes, osteosarcoma, hemangiosarcoma, prostatic adenocarcinoma, transitional cell carcinoma, urinary tract infections, urinary incontinence, autoimmune thyroiditis, hypothyroidism and hip dysplasia."

Therefore, the decision to spay or neuter a dog or cat should be made solely by the pet's owner with the direct input of their veterinarian and will be dependent on each particular animal's situation.

Additionally, research has shown that in locations where mandatory spay and neuter programs have been instituted, a decrease in the number of vaccinated and licensed animals has been seen due to poor program compliance from pet owners' fears of seeking veterinary care if their animals are still intact. This may result in decreased preventive care and regular wellness examinations which may then diminish the pet's quality of life because of increasing undiagnosed health issues. It also may result in an increase in zoonotic diseases, such as hookworm and roundworm infection in children due to poor deworming programs, and decreased compliance with routine rabies vaccination. [...]

Here's the entire statement, and the peer-reviewed scientific evidence behind it.

Why are we still listening to clueless animal-rights activists, a game-playing dis-elected professional politician and an attention-seeking former game-show host?

The California State Senate will likely take up the AB 1634 trainwreck in a session that starts in about 45 minutes (7-18-08) If you are a California resident, call your state Senator now and tell him or her that forced spay-neuter:

Increases shelter populations and kill rates;
Increases the cost to tax-payers for animal-control;
Decreases compliance with licensing and other animal-control laws (thus decreasing government revenues); and
Increases public health risk because of fewer people taking pets for in for rabies vaccinations and worming.
Call and fax your State Senator now.

<http://www.calchannel.com/archive.php>

go to pull down button and choose June 2008, then on next screen, choose date 062508 for:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SENATE COMMITTEE)

CLICK WATCH

I have been invited to attend some of the hearings, but it has always

been on days I could not appear. In meantime, Bill Hemby of PETPAC and the dog fanciers groups and NAIA are usually always there. Obviously the mandated altering provision has been radically changed-but now it smacks of zeroing in on the intact dogs or cats that might not have a license? This is true, the bill will not reduce shelter animals, but it might drive more into shelters as people who don't want to pay for an intact dog just get another dog.

See opinion sent to Legislature (Dave Cox, Sacto) on 1634, pdf done by non-AR -> costrevised-4aug It is very obvious that raising fines is just another punitive action to work against lower income owners which could only result in more animals being impounded/killed.

We are always careful to consider the "down the road" ramifications, and the AR view-when we look at what HSUS helped develop for Louisville Kentucky, which is simply amazingly ludicrous-and is now in Federal Court, with the court having REJECTED the amicus brief of HSUS TWICE now-we start to see where all this crap is coming from-but not surprising. HSUS admits they did it, so it's pretty much what you would expect. It sucks. I will publish it in a PDF later this week. It has TONS of legal cases cited-but remember-the court REJECTED it, as the court is not required to accept it over opposition. The court (Federal Appeals Ct) did allow HSUS to file an amicus in the Robt. Stevens dogfight video case, BUT we must remember-the court REJECTED HSUS' position in THAT case as well. (You can guess what the position was)..... The more cases that the Federal Courts REJECT re HSUS-the better it is for dog and pet owners..... I heard K. Breslin is getting an amicus brief from HSUS for Denver BSL appeal? That means we have the AKC in there with HSUS?

I think the brief might come in, but I think the case will not win. However we shall see.

Ciao.

Categories: AB1634-CA · AR No Breed · AR No breeding No Buying · AR propaganda · Animal Rights Hidden Agenda · Dog owner Rights · HSUS · animal control

Tagged: AB1634, animal rights legislation, HSUS legislation, intact pets

"DANGEROUS DOGS" AND WILDFIRES -OUT OF CONTROL?

July 31, 2008 · 1 Comment

Wildfires in California have long been a problem, but this year in particular has been about the worst in California's history.

It appears, according to a lengthy, detailed story from the Los Angeles times, that many of the fires are exacerbated by the

proliferation of dense young growth which has not been removed due to environmentalist lawsuits. When small trees are densely packed and then start to burn, they fall into a pyramid type shape which then causes excessive high flames to shoot straight up.

Because of this problem, the White Mountain Stewardship Project in Arizona was formed to allow the cutting of small trees (less than 16') for production of wood stove pellets, paneling and other products. The Federal government infuses a lot of cash into such a project, but as a spokesperson has stated:

"Putting out forest fires without dealing with the fuel buildup just perpetuates the problem because you're not treating the root cause."
[http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-thinning31-2008jul31,0,2690431.s](http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-thinning31-2008jul31,0,2690431.story)
tory

That brings us to the question of the dogs. It would seem that canine experts know why and what can make dogs dangerous, and it is frequently the topic of debate among members of the public, and of course by those in charge of making dog ordinances. But the public and lawmakers are not necessarily dog experts? So when laws are made in the name of "safety and welfare", we should look at the laws to see if they reasonably actually do, for example, protect the public welfare.

That's where we usually end up disagreeing, because most lawmakers think that passing any law which SOUNDS like it might help--WILL help. Frequently, despite the legislative analysis, many laws are passed because it is politically related to a favor they might owe to someone else who has passed their former legislation. And when pet owners, for example, pipe up and start an avalanche of opposition, the legislature usually (but not always) has to listen.

CANINE experts have long advanced the opinion that breed specific legislation is not the answer to dangerous dogs. And why is that? Because BSL addresses the problem with the assumption that only certain specific canine breeds are ALL timebombs waiting to go off. Of course, that is surely an opinion, and not necessarily a valid one. Most of those pushing BSL, such as the bite blogger out of Washington, know absolutely nothing about dogs--she just sees "media" stories and then republishes them.

Canine-human aggression is much more complicated than what most think. However, when we look at fatal attacks where canines have killed humans, it shows that as much as 52% of the animals were either rehomed, rescued, or shelter animals. Even if this only happened once in awhile, with the statistics on dog populations, it is nearly impossible and certainly against all odds that the approximate 15% of dogs (which are rescued, rehomed, shelter obtained) out of perhaps 70 million dogs nationwide--could make up 50% of the fatal attacks?????

We are looking at perhaps 30 dogs out of 70 million. What are the chances that half of the 30 dogs would be rescued, rehomed or shelter obtained??? If I hired a statistician, I think this would be very telling. In fact, I think I will get my friend's cousin to construct the mathematical summary for me to post here.

All of the talk about "aggressive" biting dogs and biting dogs being intact is not necessarily the "answer", as many have stated. The study (shown elsewhere on this blog) which examined the dogs which had all bitten small kids-indicated that 93% of the dogs were ALREADY ALTERED. If it was true that only intact dogs bit kids, then how is it that over 2,000 dogs can be at a dog show at the same time, and they are not biting the kids or people there?

Could it be that the ARs are in fact feeding us a bunch of BS? Could it be that the AR movements wants to desperately have us all believe that it's only intact dogs that bite, or maim, or anything bad-so that we will all alter our dogs? So that eventually there WON'T BE ANY DOGS BORN? Could it be that PEtA and friends want all dogs born ELIMINATED so that people cannot enjoy having a puppy?

So that everyone MUST adopt a dog from a foreign country-such as a stray dog? Imported puppy milled dogs have been banned from entering the country by law. What does that leave? How would one know if a dog was actually a "puppy" milled foreign dog? The puppy milled dogs from out of the mid west and the East and not illegal. HSUS has not shut them down yet. If they DID shut them down, and if small home breeders (hobby breeder) were illegal, just where would anyone obtain a puppy?

The Federal Government was notified in 2006 when a federal complaint was filed in San Francisco opposing CA SB861. The truth was told about the animal extremist groups that kept pushing SB861-and the city attorney thought that by mentioning the NAMES of several animal rights groups- those same groups, who were in favor of SB861-meant that SB861 was a "good idea." Judge Maxine Chesney appeared to be a Peta sympathizer and summarily dismissed the complaint.

Apparently the city attorney didn't know that his own employer, the Federal Government, believes that such groups are eco terrorist or at least considered to be militants who would like to see the American economy fail. [For example, the Animal Defense League-Los Angeles, is a militant group which used smoke bombs and other tactics to attempt animal shelter change; they have threatened shelter workers and basically caused severe problems at the Los Angeles shelters by demanding change on their own timetable] By getting rid of all animal products, animal use, and the pet trade, we are looking at many billions of dollars. With the economy in trouble NOW-taking out the

pet trade (\$41 Billion+), ranching, rodeos, circuses, zoos, farming, hunting, fishing, pet related businesses- would be another big blow, wouldn't it? Can you imagine the jobs, lives, and businesses that would be lost?

Categories: AB1634-CA · AR Court Cases · AR No Breed · AR propaganda · Animal Planet · BSL · Dog breed bans · Los Angeles ARs · MSN · Rescue Rehomed Shelter 50%+ of canine Fatal attacks · SB861 · VERIZON · pEtA · rescued dogs
Tagged: AB1634, fatal attacks, SB861

ANIMAL EXTREMISTS TRY COSTLY AB1634 RE-WRITE FOR CALIF
July 10, 2008 · No Comments

Most of the public outside of Los Angeles (which spawned AB1634)-does not realize that the shelter system there is so broken-there is no workable quick fix. One cannot undo years and years of allowing people to own dogs which might run at large, animal control picks up the dogs like garbage collectors, and then suddenly expect those owners to line up for mandated altering, or- paying complaint driven fines for owning an intact dog which is the subject of a complaint (notice I did not say "verified" or substantiated complaint.)

Click on pic to see petpac site re AB1634 revision.....

AND as of 7/15/08, it appears that the sadistic L Levine has NOW changed AB1634 so that SHELTERS WONT HAVE TO REPORT THEIR STATS TO THE STATE??????? Can this be true? I have not verified it. I am sick and tired of loser Levine and his AR groups.

See below for Orange County Register article-----

Monday, July 21, 2008

Pet owners gear up for spay-neuter law dogfight

POLL: Revised state bill still faces steep opposition, even after its bite is removed. Is this another 'nanny' law?

By KELLY CHEN

The Orange County Register

SACRAMENTO - The state Legislature has pet owners barking up a storm once again.

Nearly a year after controversy stopped the mandatory spay and neuter bill in its tracks, the proposal is back, this time in a watered-down form that hasn't ceased the "nanny-state" howls in Orange County and across the state.

While the original version of Assembly Bill 1634 called for sterilizing all puppies and kittens in California at 6 months old, the revised proposal affects pets impounded several times by animal control agencies.

Supporters say the amendments offer gradual steps to control pet overpopulation, but opponents maintain it's a "punishment looking for a crime."

"The bottom line is that the bill still requires mandatory spaying and neutering as a punishment," said William Hemby, the leader of a board coalition of more than 42,000 pet owners and 800 dog and cat clubs opposing the bill, PETPAC.

Hemby and other pet owners oppose the bill as unnecessary and unfair, but their central criticism is that it infringes on their personal rights.

"You try to mess with my kids, my pets, my home, I'm going to be quite upset," said Diane Amendola, a Huntington Beach resident who went from no interest in politics to leading a grass-roots campaign against the bill

Community intervention for this type of social problem requires more of a social work type intervention which uses a roundup of more than just a few techniques. There has to be a marketing element, a cultural understanding, simplistic strategy, focused target as opposed to shotgun spray targeting, multiple methods of advertising and showing animals which focus on education, proper care, and instruction. In other words, spoon feeding must be used to change societal behavior. Instead, extremists are now just trying to bring in more money from the state to make this so-called "program" workable. Hmm-CA has a gigantic deficit in the billions right now? And the extremists crafted this? If ever there was a HUGE use of subterfuge-this is straight out of HSUS!

Yet, by looking at what Petpac, the Concerned Dog Owners (who brought writ of mandate against Los Angeles and Ed Boks in April of this year) and the So Cal Blog has posted, I got a pretty good laugh-because it just goes to show that the pet owners usually know MORE about dumb laws proposed by animal extremists, and often more than the legislature realizes! Here is part of the post from the so Cal blog:

.....The Legislative Analysts Office report (full report can be found on the CDOC website) on page 106 points out that the effect of the Hayden Act is "shelters do not get more funds if more households adopt animals. Rather shelters that euthanize the most animals receive the most state funds. Shelters that are the most successful in promoting adoptions receive the least state funds." The report recommends repealing the elements of the Hayden Act that make it a mandate. It further states that "Given mandate law's focus on reimbursing local governments for activities, rather than the achievement of policy objectives, few state objectives are suitable to

implementation as mandates."

None of the reimbursement language was in the original bill. The reimbursement language is worked out by the Commission on Mandates when the states apply for reimbursement. Given the budget problems in California, it is inconceivable that all the Democrats will fall in line to create another multi-million dollar budget burden. AB 1634 is flawed in that the goal is not met by the bill. Making the keeping of an intact pet an actionable offense will do nothing to reduce the overpopulation of unwanted animals. The focus should remain on animals that are roaming "at large" without owner knowledge and control. <http://www.ckcscsc.org/blog.htm>

It comes down to what I have said before, the shelters budgets are guided by how many pets they kill. They actually seem to be rewarded for killing more? And there have already been lawsuits with government agencies suing one another over it.

The Hayden law was meant to help shelters do a better job for animals. It would appear that perhaps it has run into some trouble. Shelters are also sued by Nathan Winograd and others, for failing to adhere to the Hayden law; for example, Los angeles and Kern County shelters. Perhaps the Hayden law needs some changes these days. Maybe the extremists have unknowingly called enough attention to it so that actual beneficial change will be made, but MSN will not be part of it. I bet \$5.00 AB1634 fails. My normal bet is usually only \$1.00 so you can tell I have a lot of faith on this one, eh?

Categories: AB1634-CA · MSN

Tagged: AB1634, MSN, Petpac

PETPAC-NO KILL-WINOGRAD SPEAKS AT VENTURA SHOW

July 8, 2008 · No Comments

PETPAC and the California Dog Federation hosted a reception with Nathan Winograd presenting the topic of No Kill on 7/5/08 in the same location where approximately 7,200 dog entries over 3 days were being shown both inside and outside. For those not familiar with dog shows, this was a fairly large show comprised of 3 different clubs putting on shows over 3 days. These are large events which take about a year and a half of advance planning.

Winograd's presentation was well received by the attending group, and afterward it was apparent that people interested in dogs/cats included both animal shelter people, dog owners, dog breeders, dog rescue people, and cat owners. Nathan did mention that both dog owners, dog show people, and rescues (in fact all pet related groups) would do well to work together since the pet industry is very robust and charitable pet related donating is at an all time high.

Winograd mentioned that shelter cages sit empty in some instances, when they could have been showing a large number of pets. He also mentioned that shelter directors refused in some instances, to admit they killed animals, and that was one of the reasons why they do not like the term "no kill" because it means the shelters are "kill" shelters. (Duh?)

Above is the dog Flynn/owner from the Groomer show on Animal Planet, where the winner of the show had never hand stripped a dog. He was given a Border Terrier to groom.

In any event, as we know, Winograd does put the onus on shelters for not doing their jobs competently and asserts that the shelters need to work with volunteers, fosters, rescues, the public, and more. It is a fact that the shelters have not historically worked well with either rescues, or dog breeders; however, CA law requires that shelters work with 501(c)(3) rescues, and shelters do work with breed specific rescues (which usually often only take one breed.) Despite this, to look at the blog of Ed Boks (of LA city shelters) one would not guess that he is rated so poorly -since on its face, the blog always sounds rather positive, despite the alleged drop in the save rate:

<http://laanimalservices.blogspot.com/2008/07/creating-humane-la-call-to-action.html>

Although it has been lamented that Los Angeles has failed to obtain the necessary needed "volunteers" to help turn around the killing, it is apparent that when it comes to saving Bichon puppy-milled dogs, or Yorkie puppy-milled dogs, there is absolutely NO shortage of volunteers whatsoever-both the Bichon so-called "rescue"- and the Yorkshire (national) rescue both allege they have 800 volunteers nationwide. And these volunteers may even drive halfway across the United States just to deliver or pick up a dog.

Winograd stresses that the general "answer" to pets which cannot find homes is ruled by LES, which is legislation, education, sterilization; it is Winograd's position that LES is a failure. There is nothing wrong with legislation that is drafted well, nor education. However, most legislation is often drafted poorly and the "education" given is often based on erroneous assumptions. The sterilization efforts are often pushed by those who are tired of euthanizing animals, but where their emotional feelings cloud their judgment such that they do not consider the rational problems that would arise (which would cause the provisions re sterilization not to work, even if they cost huge amounts of money) -case in point being California's AB1634.

Above is Jerri with her pet mini Schnauzer. Jerri did not realize the problems with AB1634 but after realizing what was going on, when explained in detail, she agreed that AB1634 is a problem.

Theory-wise, if properly drafted, education principles being correct, and sterilization goals being realistic, lowering pet euthanizing could show progress, but it does take time and is not usually an overnight thing. Although Nevada has been shown (in one city) to have radically altered its kill rate, much of the success depends upon not only the numbers of animals taken in, but on the overall socio-economic situation, and oftentimes the types of dog breeds involved, such as small, medium, or large dogs. If the killing was formerly mostly feral cats, and a huge program of feral cat sterilization was implemented, that could also make a big difference. The attitudes of the shelter personnel make a large difference and according to Winograd-if the shelter personnel don't believe they can save the animals, they basically will not be saved. And by looking at Winograd's blog of 7/9/08 <http://nathanwinograd.blogspot.com/2008/07/do-pit-bulls-get-bad-rap.html>, it is interesting to note that he was able to dissect an alleged pitbull story (where dog was euthanized) despite not knowing that there is a trial set in Colorado next month on Aurora's BSL ordinance.

Because PETPAC and other pet related groups believe that saving shelter animals is possible even without mandated sterilization (as proven by Winograd's no kill equation, for example)-it is believed that MSN serves little purpose, and is simply a catch all to allegedly save money and "save" animals-but with adverse consequences-such as creating even more shelter animals, without saving any money. Shelter costs are mostly fixed expenses and if anything, they increase rather than decrease. Insurance costs, gasoline, COL increases, retirement expenses, insurance for workers compensation, etc. usually increase and are not eliminated by less animals being admitted, however, if a shelter's budget is based upon the number of animals killed (and this is not uncommon) then many shelters may not actually want a budget "decrease" which would adversely affect their budgets.

Overall, Winograd's presentation showed that the plight of shelter animals is not hopeless, but Nathan does not touch upon every reality since it would be too time consuming. On the other hand, very few shelters have actually attained true no kill status, which does show that it is certainly not an easy road, but that it is possible with a lot of hard work. Perhaps the hard work is not on the agenda for many shelter directors.

Categories: AB1634-CA · AR No breeding No Buying · MSN · No kill · dog rescue · rescued dogs
Tagged: AB1634, MSN, No kill

CA AB1634-Revised-ELIMINATES PET OWNERS' RIGHTS TO DEFEND THEMSELVES AGAINST COMPLAINTS
June 22, 2008 · No Comments

CA AB1634: Revised Bill Eliminates Pet Owners' Rights to Defend Themselves, Encourages False Accusations with NO Right to a Hearing-will Create Huge Costs-Will NOT Save \$
by JOHN YATES

American Sporting Dog Alliance

<http://www.americansportingdogalliance.org>

asda@csonline.net *See petdefense note at bottom

SACRAMENTO, CA - Animal rights extremists would be given unchecked vigilante powers to attack dog owners under a revision to AB1634, which is now before the legislature.

The Senate Local Government Committee heard the bill this Wednesday, June 25th. Originally a statewide mandate for spaying or neutering almost all dogs, it was defeated last year, but has been given new life through an agreement by its primary sponsor, Rep. Lloyd Levine, and Senate Local Government Committee Chairman Gloria Negrete McLeod.

On the surface, the revised legislation removes mandatory spay and neuter, which has lulled some dog owners into thinking that this issue has been dropped.

However, an analysis of the legislation by the American Sporting Dog Alliance (and others including attorneys and lobbyists) shows that the revised bill approaches mandatory spay and neuter through a backdoor approach that is perhaps far more devastating to dog owners than the original version.

The legislation empowers anyone to make a complaint alleging that any dog owner is in violation of any law or local ordinance. The complaint does not have to be proven, and it appears dog owners are denied the right to challenge a complaint through an administrative review process. Those who show dogs realize that a dog show info might open up a can of worms for the AR faction because they could obtain the personal name, address and perhaps phone number of dog owners with intact dogs. (The bill does not say complaint must be from one living in the same county; theoretically, it would appear to give rise to complaints by those having intent on revenge such as ex spouse, ex co-worker, ex roommates, disgruntled employee, disgruntled neighbors, et al)

A simple complaint might establish guilt under the revised legislation. This legislative sleight of hand would allow animal rights activists to act as vigilantes by searching the state and reporting any dog owner who does something they don't like, even if

their complaints are pure fiction.

The only exclusion is that a complaint about barking dogs does not trigger the enforcement actions of this legislation. All other alleged dog law violations are included.

Already written into the existing law is the provision that THE GOVERNMENT IS IMMUNE FROM ANY CIVIL SUIT THAT might arise out of the mandated altering. So, if we take a bogus complaint, levy a fine, log the bogus complaint-it means in essence that the complaints COUNT, and that the OWNER of the pet has NO ABILITY TO CONTEST the complaint, AND then has NO ability via the LAW to redress any civil wrongs since the law has built in immunity. [See FN below]

In fact, some believe that the poorly written bill actually makes OWNING an "intact" pet a separate offense! It is believed that the Appropriations committee will review the bill on 7/14/08, and at that time, PETPAC and others will no doubt bring up the excessive costs that would result from the man hours needed to handle/log/act on/fine/impound animals. [Although advocates of the bill claim it would save millions of \$\$, the actual time it would take to follow up on every complaint, impounding, and probably killing the pet when owner won't redeem it--is fairly obvious--resulting in more killed pets, more man hours expended, and more unpaid fines!]

Still another example would be if an animal rights activist trespassed on private property, and a dog acted defensively by snarling and jumping. Such a dog could be accused of being a dangerous dog, simply for protecting its home against a stranger. The legal trick is to call an alleged violation an "administrative" issue, rather than a crime or a violation of civil law. For crimes or violations of civil law, a person is entitled to defend him or herself in court, and the burden of proof is on the state.

[*Original posting by J. Yates has been modified/updated by Petdefense blog]

Senator Michael Machado
State Capitol, Room 5066
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 651-4005
Fax: (916) 323-2304

Senator.Machado@sen.ca.gov

<http://www.americansportingdogalliance.org>. Our email is ASDA@csonline.net

The American Sporting Dog Alliance also needs your help so that we can continue to work to protect the rights of dog owners. Your membership, participation and support are truly essential to the success of our mission. We are funded solely by the donations of our

members, and maintain strict independence.

****Note:** Petpac lobbyist and another attorney will be working on the issues they have found to be objectionable in this bill. One of the updated problems is that a case from 2003 found that Section 30804.7 (which this bill amends) did NOT confer immunity on the city/county against civil suits, because there was no mention of mandated altering in the code section. That immunity provision was not removed, SO if AB1634 DOES mention mandated altering, the existing immunity provision may then be impliedly enforceable, since the 1998 version of the bill had mandated altering when first written. This means that a frivolous attempt to take out one's pet through a complaint, if acted upon, with no process for contesting it, could end up with an unjust result where pet owner could not sue the city/county due to the immunity provision. The case which brought up this issue at the Appellate level [4th DCA, case from San Diego] involved a dog that was altered by the city or county program, and it died because due to the stitches not holding up, the dog bled to death.

PLEASE CROSS-POST AND FORWARD THIS REPORT TO YOUR FRIENDS

Categories: AB1634-CA · AR Harassment · Constitutional Issues · MSN
Tagged: AB1634, Add new tag, MSN, AB1634 revised, MSN issues, CA
AB1634, Lloyd Levine

ANIMAL EXTREMISTS, AB1634 LOSE BIG IN CALIFORNIA-NO MSN!
June 16, 2008 · No Comments

AB1634, the proposed statewide CA mandated, forced "sterilization" bill of 98% of pets, pushed by animal extremists (see below) and other misled animal groups who mistakenly believed the misrepresentations pushed by Mancuso and her group-HAS COMPLETELY FAILED NOW, AS A 3 TIME LOSER IN THE LEGISLATURE.

However-in an attempt to revive a 1998 push, the AB1634 has again attempted to push MSN by doing 2 things: (1) using an immunity clause that would prevent ANY city/county from liability on civil claims and (2) adding MSN to pets that are the "subjects" of "complaints" by 3rd parties-BUT with NO way to contest such complaints by dog owner. When coupled together (the no liability and the no complaint process) what do we end up with? Complaints that end up altering pets w/o any proof that such complaints are VALID AND-a provision in the law that the city/county are immune from civil liability. So even if the county altered dog owner's dog, where dog owner was innocent, dog OWNER has NO recourse against the city/or county! And if they kill the dog via negligence through bad vet procedures or anything else which amounts to negligence, the dog owner is screwed over!

Most of the push for MSN (mandatory spay-neuter) came as a result of

the animal radicals (see pic below) and their relentless harassment and tertiary targeting of the Los Angeles animal control, the mayor, and Ed Boks.....[seehttp://www.baddoglaws.com](http://www.baddoglaws.com) [click on AB1634 navi button] for the picture of the actual ADL-Los Angeles web site (Animal Defense League, Los Angeles) which clearly admits they are a militant grassroots animal extremist group who will take matters into their own hands to get change. They admit they will not concede nor take any pleas to get out of jail. Ever.

In an effort to capitalize on these actions, extremists like Mancuso (Peta indoctrinated) decided to propose MSN for the entire state, WITH ED BOKS helping to propose statewide MSN. Why? So Ed Boks could be relieved of the harassment of the radicals!! This is not a secret, but has been the story in Los Angeles for several years, and they even allowed an AR (Charlotte Laws) to come in and devise the "master plan" for no kill in which she admitted that she will label all pitbull type dogs as "unadoptable" and then banish them from Los Angeles forever. [Talk about misuse of the no-kill philosophy!]

There is no Hidden Agenda with these Extremists, (see pic below)..... it is believed to be a photo of the Los Angeles demonstrators against the shelter.... they clearly want dogs and cats to stop being killed, but they are not interested in using conventional methods, therefore they plotted to get each and every person involved with the shelters in Los Angeles either fired, out on stress leave, give up the job or otherwise quit working or transferred out for whatever reason. They then put a list of all these employees with their pictures online, and put a large red X on top of the person's face after he/she quit or were fired, etc. Recently it appears that the pictures may have been removed from their website.

This went on for months and now years, Los Angeles mayor was targeted, and Ed Boks was called the puppy killer and worse names; the group and followers would hold marches and demonstrations carrying a huge stuffed animal dog which was being crucified on a cross, held up high by two male supporters. There were also times when they would go to the employees' homes, and use smoke bombs and other methods of gaining widespread attention.

It was said that Ed Boks was targeted and possibly afraid for his life, but Ed Boks decided to get with a PeTa person and introduce "no-kill" whereby if that would pass (and it did pass in the city of Los Angeles, but is being challenged in court)- they figured getting AB1634 for MSN in the entire state should be a piece of cake.

Maybe they didn't exactly think that the general public or pet owners in general would object to the piece of cake they wanted..... However, not only did they object, most of the public was against AB1634 as proposed, even though many do not actually understand the reasoning

behind MSN and why it would not work the way the extremists claim it would work.

AB1634 WAS COMPLETELY GUTTED by the CA legislature-AND MANDATED ALTERING FOR 98% OF THE PETS IN CALIFORNIA IS NOW A DEAD ISSUE UNTIL THE EXTREMISTS TRY AND BRING IT BACK!!

See this article in Capitol Weekly, the newspaper of California Government

and politics.....

http://www.capitolweekly.net/article.php?_adctlid=v%7Cjq2q43wvsl855o%7Cx78zacvza80m0r&issueId=x781twtlblc4pt&xid=x78y8aosvmshcp

SPAY-NEUTER BILL GETS GUTTED IN COMMITTEE

(published Thursday, June 19, 2008)

One of the most controversial bills of the year looks like it will finally get to the Senate floor soon-though is a very altered form. AB 1634, from Assemblyman Lloyd Levine, D-Van Nuys, originally called for spaying or neutering of any dog or cat over six months of age, with exceptions for breeders, working animals and some others. As amended in the Senate Local Government Committee, the new version calls for the sterilization only of a dog that has been taken into the shelter system three times or a cat that has been in twice.

Levine met on Monday with Senator Gloria Negrete-McLeod, D-Chino, according to both offices. She said changes needed to be made to get the votes to get the bill out of committee and onto the Senate floor, and Levine agreed. Negrete-McLeod now appears as a principal coauthor on the bill.

"I don't think this will satisfy the extremists on either side of the, but this is better policy," Negrete-McLeon said. She added, "You have a bad dog, snip-snip."

Titled the California Healthy Pets Act, it was one of the most talked-about bills of last year. Legislative offices reported getting huge amounts of mail, phone calls, emails and faxes on the bill. Levine made several amendments last year, mainly around creating exemptions for particular classes of dogs and cats, as he tried to placate the opponents. But he said he was not disappointed over moving forward with a much less sweeping bill, noting that it will result in the spaying/neutering of some of the most problematic animals.

"It's the legislative process," Levine said. "You never get everything you want. The purpose of my legislation was to address the serious problem of cat and dog overpopulation. I feel that this will

help us accomplish that goal. I'm not unhappy with it. One of the first things they tell you when you come to work in the Capitol is 'never fall in love with your bills.'"

Judie Mancuso, the campaign director behind the effort to pass AB 1634, was less positive about the changes. For one thing, she said, the home foreclosure crisis is worsening the overpopulation problem at shelters as people give up pets when they move out of owned houses into rented apartments. For all of 2006, she said, California shelters took in 375,000 dogs, euthanizing 146,000. For 2007, shelters took in 419,000 dogs-but 10 counties have not yet reported all their numbers for last year, compared to only one that hasn't reported 2006 numbers. The 2008 numbers, she said, are looking even worse.

She also pointed to numerous other governments around the country-including the state legislatures of Arizona and Rhode Island-that have modeled bills on AB 1634.

"The rest of the country has long looked to our lead," Mancuso said. "The thing that concerns me is the message we're sending out is this is all we can do."

*Note: the pic above was not and is not shown in Capitol Weekly. It is shown here to let people know what kind of people are pushing change in Los Angeles, where such change is not fast enough for them. When they do not get what they want, they seek to take things into their own hands. If they were protesting like most people, they wouldn't need to wear a mask.

What has happened in major large cities is that animal extremists want to push the saving of all animals. While there is nothing wrong with saving animals, one has to have some common sense to realize that AB1634 was nothing but a nightmare with so many pitfalls it was simply ludicrous. And no amount of changing it would create a bill that would work. which explains why it was gutted. Am glad to see that someone in government finally did something rather intelligent.

The completely new, AB1634 now supposedly deals with public complaints re a cat/dog, subsequent fines, and mandated altering. Although there is no procedure noted in the bill for a hearing, opponents intend to oppose the bill if it will purposely exclude any type of admin hearing. Because the bill does not have a specific provision concerning the determination of "guilty" re a complaint, it is conceivable that complaints made purposely without cause could create a problem if no proof/or evidence is shown.

Categories: AB1634-CA · AR Harassment · AR Truth-Tell People! · MSN
Tagged: Add new tag, MSN, Ed Boks, ADL-Los angeles, AB 1634

<- Older Entries

CATEGORIES

4th Amendment

AB1634-CA

AB2296-CA Calif. Anti-AR proposed Law

Advocacy Store-Pets

animal control

Animal Planet

Animal Rights Hidden Agenda

AR Court Cases

AR Harassment

AR No Breed

AR No breeding No Buying

AR propaganda

AR Truth-Tell People!

AR Violence

BSL

BSL MISLEADING STATEMENTS

BSL MISREPRESENTATIONS

Constitutional Issues

Craigslist

Defamation

Denver Dog Law

Dog breed bans

Dog owner Rights

dog rescue

Dog-Property Lawsuits

Dogfight video

Fun

HSUS

Los Angeles ARs

milled dogs

MSN

MSN-The AR Pitch, PeTa's No Birth Nation ABC Rule for D

No Buy

No kill

Paralegal Help

Pet Advocacy Store

pEtA

pitbull

political BSL

Prepaid Legal Plans

Rational Basis

Rescue Rehomed Shelter 50%+ of canine Fatal attacks

rescued dogs

SB861

Uncategorized

VERIZON

RECENT POSTS

DOG KENNEL OWNERS+BREEDERS NOW TARGET BY HSUS-ASPCA FOR DOGFIGHTING?
LOSING IN COURT BSL CASES AND WHY?
DANGEROUS DOGS AND ANIMAL EXTREMISTS
NEW: AB1634 DEFEATED!!! KILLING MORE PETS IS NOT THE ANSWER!
NEW: LA CITY 'MSN' A PREDICTED FAILURE-"NO" ENFORCEMENT NOW?
PAGES

About, Email and Notice....
ARs bully Pet Store, Publish Bunk info..
DANGEROUS DOGS AND ANIMAL EXTREMISTS
Shelter dogs: Adopt out bad dogs, kill Good ones?
Solution to High Shelter Killing-and the Lies Told
ARCHIVES

August 2008
July 2008
June 2008
May 2008
April 2008
BLOGROLL

american sporting Dog Alliance
Bad laws re pets
CAVEAT
Dog Politics
Doggiedefenders
Internet Library of Law+Court decisions
Love does not Discriminate
PETPAC
Reptiles and ARs
SoCaldoglawblog
Umbrella Coalition for Pet Owners against Anti-pet Legislation
USSPORTSMEN'S ALLIANCE
Why Dogs Bite
META

Log in
Entries RSS
Comments RSS
WordPress.org

BLOG AT WORDPRESS.COM. THEME: OUTLINE BY CHRIS PEARSON.