



SAVE THE EASY  
BUY U.S. BOND  
PAYROLL SAVINGS



THIS SIDE OF CARD IS FOR ADDRESS

City Clerk.

Wog? Rept.

San Diego, Calif.

San Diego Calif.  
Aug. 2<sup>nd</sup> 1947.

City Clerk  
San Diego, Calif.

Dear Sir:-

If there is a Rog ordinance, the dogs coming my way don't seem to understand it. Some run loose here from morning till night.

I have sometimes thought of getting a dog so that my dog could re-pay some of the compliments these dogs have given me.

Please curb loose dogs.

Wm. E. Kreiss.

3351-31<sup>st</sup> Street.

City!

THIS SIDE OF CARD IS FOR ADDRESS

City Manager  
San Diego




August 2, 1947.

Dear Sir,

I want the law passed  
against dogs. They spoil  
my garden and bark  
all night.

Frank Kunka



THIS SIDE OF CARD IS FOR ADDRESS

City Council's Office  
Civic Center Bldg  
City

8-2-47

Gentlemen

By all means please  
pass the dog ordinance

I am voicing the consent  
of at least a dozen tax-  
payers, including myself.

Yours  
W. Gauringer  
4227-39th City

4765 Adams Ave.  
San Diego 5, Calif.  
August 2, 1947.

Honorable City Council;  
City of San Diego.

Sirs;

In the vicinity of my home there live several dog owners, who without apparent harm to these animals, have placed such restraint on their activities that they have no nuisance value and are welcomed in the neighborhood.


However: there are a minority of others who allow their dogs to roam at large and to make general pests of themselves by befouling lawns, shrubbery, and gardens; by barking and howling; and by forcing automobile drivers to erratic driving in an effort to avoid striking them.

You may believe me that the daily task of acting as chambermaid for these animals is a disgusting one and is not alleviated by the knowledge that the owners often release the dogs for the purpose of saving themselves this same unpleasant task.

No ordinance is required to force a gentleman to have a decent consideration for the nicer sensibilities of his fellow man: but, unfortunately, there are those so lacking in this virtue that they recognize only the restraints which carry punishment for non-observance.

Therefore: I earnestly request protection from this nuisance by the passage and enforcement of an ordinance requiring that dogs be either confined in an enclosure or carried on a leash.

Very Truly Yours

  
Paul Smith

Philip Steinman  
4224 Randolph Street  
San Diego 3, California

August, 4, 1947.

To the Hon. Mayor and the San Diego City Council: -

There is a poll taken by the City clerk on this infernal dog question. I am opposed to all roaming animals, poultry or live stock of any discription.

On Jan. 22, 1945 I wrote you a letter and a resolution proposing a "Roaming Live Stock" ordinance. You did not deem it expedient to answer my communication. I do not like to be treated that way when my taxes pay your salaries.

I am a native born U.S. citizen, a voter, a property owner and taxpayer and I demand a reply when I address you, my servants.

Mission Hills is overrun by dogs, and are a special nuisance, hazard and disturbers of the peace of the citizens for more than seven years. These dogs run after high powered engines (autos), hold up citizens, especially in the vicinity of the Frances Parker School.

You and the police dept. have been notified more than once of these conditions but they still exist.

You have enacted a few wishy-washy ordinances against dogs which are just so much pap.

yours Truly

Philip Steinman.

3655 Chamourne Avenue  
San Diego, 5, California  
August 1, 1947

City Council  
San Diego, California

Gentlemen:

We as citizens of this city feel that it is right for people who own dogs to take care of them. We feel that the only way that this can be done is by the enforcement of a stricter law on dog control.

We are heartily in support of the new ordinance. This new law will not in any way disturb people who want to take care of their dogs, and those who don't and don't care how much of a public menace their dogs are should be forced to take care of them instead of their neighbors having to tolerate the annoyance brought about by dogs always on the loose.

One morning last week we counted 9 loose dogs in our block. To permit dogs to run loose is not fair to the best citizens of this city. We pay taxes and work hard to take care of our property, and it doesn't make us very happy to have 4 or 5 dogs come into our yard or garden and practically destroy it.

A dog is a fine animal and a wonderful pet when he is in his place. That place, we feel, is in his owner's yard or on a leash.

We sincerely hope that something will be done about this nuisance - the sooner the better.

Sincerely,  
Mrs. Roy V. Allison  
Roy V. Allison

Pacific Beach, California

August 1 1947

To the Honorable Mayor and City Councilmen;

Dear Sirs;

Regarding the proposed City ordinance concerning dogs, allow me to say that I am a lover of dogs and have owned dogs where and when it was possible to let them roam at will without the probability of them molesting the person or property of others.

I am against allowing dogs to be at large on our City streets because of the nuisance they create to other people and property owners; for instance, this year, six people in our block were treated for rabies infection caused by a bite from a dog allowed to run at large.

I am for a rigid and enforced ordinance for the protection of others.

Yours respectfully

*Geo. L. White*

1214 Emerald st.  
San Diego 9, Calif.

DOCUMENT No. 376180

Filed August 4, 1947

FRED W. SICK, City Clerk

By Clark M. Foote, City Clerk Deputy

By Deputy

COMMUNICATIONS

FROM

Residents relative to  
proposed Ordinance  
regulating the keeping  
of dogs.

(For the Ordinance)