

2009 Emerald St., San Diego, 9,
Calif., January 3rd, 1944

San Diego City Council,
San Diego, Calif.

De Sraff
Regarding proposal of Mr. Austin that dogs be confined when not on leash under supervision of owner.

Gentlemen:-

I am writing to ask that this proposal be dropped permanently or else put over until such a time as when the men who are now away fighting for the American way of life may have the opportunity to express themselves on this subject. It seems rather underhanded to put over various kinds of prohibitions in their absence, from important national issues not vital to the war effort to this comparatively trivial matter, the enactment of which can hardly be of any great moment other than to those who allow petty irritations and personal grudges to assume exaggerated proportions.

Few dogs are in the nuisance class, and the unfairness of sentencing all dogs to virtual imprisonment because of these few should be evident to any impartial person.

Respectfully,

(Mrs) E. C. Powell

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

JAN 8 10 41 AM 1944

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

San Diego, California.
January 8th 1944.

To the Mayor and City Council
of the City of San Diego, Calif.

Honorable Gentlemen:

I love dogs and pets and in defense of my faithful little canine friend who loves and respects me regardless of what human beings may think of me I am opposed to the proposed leashing ordinance for three excellent reasons:

1. To restrain a dog with a leash is in most instances the worst form of cruelty to animals. Most of the dogs are not broken to handling with the leash, and to try to train them would positively be extreme cruelty since it is very difficult to train them after they pass the puppy stage. Since the leash ordinance has been under discussion I have made it a point to observe the manner in which leashed dogs are handled by their masters. In seventy-five percent of the cases the masters were cruel to a certain extent and some to the "steenth" degree. Since in most instances, if the leashing ordinance is passed, the care of the dog will be largely in the hands of unexperienced children there will be a tremendous amount of unknowingly and unintentional cruelty. Why subject helpless animals to such excruciating cruelty just to please a very few dog haters ?
2. I am opposed to the leashing ordinance because it will take more than ten times our present police force to cannot enforce it. It will be like the prohibition law absolutely unenforcible. The children will have their dogs out on the street with them in spite of all that can be said or done. It is easy to start children on criminal path, so, why make it a crime for them to have their poodle on the street with them thus starting them on the downward path of juvenile delinquency and crime ?
3. Dogs must have a certain amount of exercise in order to remain healthy. They store up energy just like children do and must have a like opportunity to expend it. This it cannot get out in the ordinary back yard. The dogs did not come into our city because of their own free will or wishes. We brought them into it, hence, are responsible for their welfare and health. They are helpless in the matter, I plead with you not to pass an ordinance that will require the dogs to be on a leash when out upon the streets.

I am Post Air Raid Warden in my post. As such it was my duty to learn the number of dogs and cats in our post. While performing this duty I found only two dog haters in the post. They watch each morning to keep the dogs off their lawns and the same happens when the children pass going to and from school - "they must be made to keep on the side walk". Such people are not getting any joy or pleasure out of life and do not want to see any one else do it. They are ardent leash ordinance supporters. Wish I could lead them around with leash, for a while, treat them the same as I have seen dogs treated and see how they would like it.

Very respectfully submitted

George Welsh Tyler

George Welsh Tyler,
3811 Pershing Avenue,
San Diego, 4, Calif.

JAN 10 2 38 PM 1944

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

January 25, 1944
San Diego, Calif.

Gentlemen:

As long as the proposal for curbing the liberty and freedom of dogs effects me, and as I am a long resident and tax payer of San Diego, I have the right to voice my opinion on this issue.

One argument is that my husband, Lieut. Brown, is now overseas and fighting for that privilege of liberty so dear to us all. Liberty, in one sense, of allowing our pets and uncomplaining friends, the dog, to live.

It should be brought to mind too, that the dog himself is fighting and dying with our men in this war for the preservation of freedom. The dog is distinguishing himself as a good, brave soldier and is wisely and fearlessly executing the orders given him.

Do we forget so soon the many deaths that have been averted because of the watchfulness and devotion of our pets to their masters and families?

We who comply with the law by purchasing the necessary licenses for our pets have been of the opinion that they are considered citizens of that city. Should all pets suffer because a few are destructive? It might be well to remember that the percentage of animal destruction is very small compared to that due to drunkenness and juvenile delinquency.

Please take this into consideration.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Leo Rolland Brown

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

JAN 29 9 25 AM 1944

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

DOCUMENT No. 346777

Filed FEB 14 1944

FRED W. SICK
CITY CLERK
MARK AL FORTNA JR.

By Deputy

COMMUNICATION

FROM

J. P. Mason relative
to proposed Ordinance
regulating the keeping
of dogs.