

San Diego,  
Aug. 4, 1947

City Counsel  
City of San Diego,

Gentlemen:

The City Manager's secretary has, in her friendly manner, advised us many times about what to do about our dog problems. I am positive that many people feel as I do, that there should be an enforced ordinance, giving non-dog-owners protection from these constant annoyances of some one else's pet.

Many times I have taken a new route on my way to work, after detouring a whole block to keep from passing the house where the watch dog is untied and actually ferocious.

Many times we have lost that precious last hour of sleep from 5 to 6 a.m. because an unthinking neighbor, who no doubt could sleep through a bombing raid, has gotten used to his dog's constant barking.

Many times, a pleasant breakfast is spoiled from having to pick up garbage that some hound on the loose has upset before the collector arrived.

Many times our lawn mower has protested being wheeled over our lawn,

which, but for the neighbor's dog, large as a cow. (the resemblance doesn't stop there) would be a smooth carpet.

Many more paragraphs like the ones above would bore you, but I should like to say that whereas a lot of fanatic dog lovers may appear at the meeting of the City Council - many working people, not able to be there, will wait for some action.

San Diego has provided such a beautiful location for happy homes - why shouldn't all tax payers deserve a measure of protection from disturbances of the peace and from general nuisances.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs A. J. Hopkins.

4753 Biona Drive  
San Diego 4, Calif.  
4 August, 1947

Council of the City of San Diego  
San Diego, California

Gentlemen:

As a property owner in the City of San Diego, it is my request that you give favorable consideration to the ordinance pertaining to the control of dogs.

Dogs have been a filthy nuisance to my property and their barking and howling at night have disturbed my rest. A short time ago it was necessary for me to go to the authorities due to the fact that a neighbor directly across the street kept some 12 or 14 dogs.

Let's keep San Diego a city of which to be proud — not one of dirty, filthy lawns.

Yours very truly

*Mrs. Dorothy M. Hooper*  
MRS. DOROTHY M. HOOPER

4753 Biona Drive  
San Diego 4, California

August 4th 1947

Council of the  
City of San Diego  
San Diego, Calif.

Gentlemen:

As a citizen and taxpayer of the City of San Diego, it is my earnest request that you give favorable consideration to the proposed ordinance for the control of dogs.

It is my experience that loose dogs are a nuisance to my property; my family and self have been subject to attack by vicious bands of dogs roving the neighborhood and more particularly dogs barking nights have cost me a good many sleepless hours.

I also concur with opinions I have read by Doctors that dogs not properly cared for and controlled are a menace to health.

Thanking you, I am

Yours very truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "W. H. Hooper", followed by a long horizontal line extending to the right.

W. H. Hooper

4 August 1947

City Council  
San Diego, California

Gentlemen:

I would consider it an invaluable contribution to peaceful and healthful living in San Diego if the proposed ordinance regarding control of dogs were passed.

Sincerely yours,

*Nedred S. Cummings*

4753 Biona Drive

7/30/47.

City Council.

Please pass that ordinance  
as I am getting tired of planting  
a new lawn every 3 months.  
and raise the tax on dogs  
to \$25.00 and bitches to \$40.00

Respectfully Yours  
L.A. Van Reed.

3422 Voltaine Street  
San Diego 6 Calif.  
2 August 1947

Mr Charles Wincke  
Councilman San Diego

Dear Sir - I too like dogs but hope the City ordinance  
will be passed and enforced so that some of these so called  
dog laws will be made to take care of their dogs.  
Do you suppose dog owners ever think of the damage their  
pets do to their neighbors lawns, flowers and shrubs?  
I maintain that dog laws who take care of their dogs should  
welcome this City ordinance and have nothing to fear in its passage.

E. F. Luistrom  
3422 Voltaine St.  
San Diego 6 Calif.

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

AUG 5 2 34 PM 1947

RECEIVED  
CITY CLERK

August 4, 1947  
San Diego, Calif.

Gentlemen:

We the undersigned would like to vote for the proposed Ordinance to control dogs, and that it be enforced.

We have been subject to much annoyance in this neighborhood, by dogs, whose owners have no control over them, and allow them to ruin our flowers and lawns, and bark at all hours of the night.

Sincerely,

Mr & Mrs. Peter Friz,

2916 - Spruce St,

Mr. & Mrs. Harvey Phillips  
2923 Spruce St,

Mrs E. E. Rodabough

2912 1/2 Spruce St

Mrs Alba Scanlin  
2918 Spruce St.

4548 Hawley Blvd.,  
San Diego 4, Calif.,  
August 3, 1947.

Dear Sirs:

Let us pass this legislation to prohibit dogs running the streets at large.

They are a nuisance, as plenty of trash and litter is scattered by them, being scavengers by nature. Also much damage to flowers and shrubs is caused by them.

No real dog lover will protest this legislation, as they keep their pets confined in order to give them the care and protection they need.

Respectfully yours

Mrs. Esther Schory.



# LA JOLLA BUSINESS SERVICE

Frank J. O'Donnell

PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT  
INCOME TAX CONSULTANT

7761 Fay Avenue

Phone G 5-6225

La Jolla, California

STREAMLINED SYSTEMS  
INSTALLED AND MAINTAINED

TAX RETURNS  
SALES, SOCIAL SECURITY, WITHOLDING, ETC.

NOTARY PUBLIC  
PUBLIC STENOGRAPHER

August 2, 1947.

Common Council of the City of San Diego,  
Civic Center, San Diego, Calif.

Gentlemen:

This letter may have some practical value in the present "dog controversy" because it presents the viewpoint of a citizen of San Diego who has loved dogs for 50 odd years, but believes that the ownership of a dog involves a responsibility not to permit his dog to commit nuisances against other citizens.

So, as a dog lover, I am heartily in favor of the dog ordinance passed unanimously by the City Council on Dec. 26, 1944.

As a dog lover I am violently opposed to the proposed new dog ordinance now being considered by the City Council.

The existing ordinance, requiring owners to keep their dogs on their own premises or under their control while out walking, is just and fair to all concerned. Real dog lovers do this voluntarily to protect their pets from being mangled under automobiles, contracting diseases, and being picked up and sold to vivisectionists for torture.

The present law has been in effect for almost three years, yet not the slightest effort seems to have been made to enforce it.

Now it is proposed that you substitute for it a law based on malice and sponsored by dog haters - a law that will try to force every owner of a dog to drag along on a leash with his pet at all times, regardless of any need for the handcuffs; - a law that will make every dog owner a constant target for malicious attempts at legal persecution by anyone who bears him a grudge. It contains no provision for protection of the dog owner or the dog; - no penalty for dog stealing, dog poisoning, or dog torture. It has "dog hater" written all over it.

How will such a drastic, unneeded, one-sided, and highly unpopular ordinance cause the thousands of citizens who are dog owners to react if enforcement is attempted? The great majority of them are paying little attention to the matter now. Is it necessary or wise to stir up the antagonism, bitterness and opposition that enforcement of such an ordinance would engender; to drive these citizens into forming organizations of dog owners to battle the dog haters - with every prospect that the battle-ground will be the City Council chambers?



# LA JOLLA BUSINESS SERVICE

Frank J. O'Donnell

PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT  
INCOME TAX CONSULTANT

7761 Fay Avenue

Phone G 5-6225

La Jolla, California

STREAMLINED SYSTEMS  
INSTALLED AND MAINTAINED

TAX RETURNS  
SALES, SOCIAL SECURITY, WITHOLDING, ETC.

NOTARY PUBLIC  
PUBLIC STENOGRAPHER

Common Council of the City of San Diego

- 2 -

Has the police department the time to spare from handling crimes of violence, robberies, and automobile laws enforcement to go chasing every citizen they see harmlessly walking his dog without a leash? Or is enforcement to be on a punitive basis through malicious complaints of dog haters?

Is it fair to wish this job on the police department? Or the aftermath on the city courts?

Do dog haters pay city licenses? Dog lovers do.

Law needs the moral support of the majority of the citizens to be effective. This proposed ordinance will NOT have it, because it will be construed as an attack on dogs and dog owners. Dogs have earned the title of "man's best friend", even if they occasionally use a lawn because no plumbing facilities are provided for them. If they bark at night it is undoubtedly annoying - though considerably less so than the vociferous nocturnal love affairs of the pussycats. Yet a dog's bark has prevented many a burglary and saved many a life. The vast majority of decent humans are fond of dogs. Put it on the ballot and let's see how many votes the vindictive minority of dog haters can scare up.

The crux of the whole situation is that the "dog nuisances" that many people justly complain of are caused by the owners who allow their dogs to run at large day and night.

If THAT FEATURE OF THE EXISTING DOG LAW IS ENFORCED a large percentage of the dog lovers themselves will be in favor of it, and there will be no need for any new ordinances or placing the members of your honorable body in the middle of a lot of future dog fights.

Respectfully yours,

*Frank J. O'Donnell*

ARNOLD SERVICE SINCE 1869

SUBDIVISIONS  
PROPERTY--  
MANAGEMENT  
RESIDENCE  
RANCH AND  
BUSINESS  
PROPERTIES  
EXCHANGES  
INVESTMENTS  
MORTGAGES  
INSURANCE  
LEASES  
RENTALS



OFFICE OF  
CHAS. E. ARNOLD



*Wm H. McCreary*  
MANAGER  
1130 SEVENTH AVENUE

**San Diego, Cal.**

July 29, 1947.

City Attorney,  
San Diego, Calif.

Dear Mr. Attorney:

Orchids to you! for trying to curb  
the dog annoyances.

Perhaps 75% of the families do not  
own dogs and they, plus those who now control their dogs,  
are FOR YOU in your attempt.

Sincerely yours,

Charles E. Arnold.

CEA/A

20 10 8 9 50

FRANK B. BENNETT

ATTORNEY AT LAW  
340 BANK OF AMERICA BUILDING  
625 BROADWAY  
SAN DIEGO 1, CALIFORNIA  
PHONE MAIN 7218

July 29th 1947

CHAS B WINCOTE ESQ  
City Councilman  
Civic Center  
San Diego Calif

Re NEW DOG ORDINANCE

Sir:

I am heartily in favor of the proposed new Dog Ordinance, and something should be done about cats too.

I own a nice corner at Palmetto Way and Arbor Drive, try to keep a clean lawn and yard, but it is an almost hopeless task what with the loose dogs and cats making their toilet in my yard; some dog owners even have the gall to bring their dogs on leash to perform their ablutions on my front lawn in preference to messing up their own premises.

During the day the neighborhood cats stalk and kill the mocking birds, at night yowl under our windows, dig up and scatter any soft topsoil in order to leave their dirty messes.

I was in the City Prosecutor's office for several years and I certainly can corroborate what the present Prosecutor, Mr. Ed Law, has to say about the multiplicity of complaints due to cats and dogs.

From years of observation I have come to the conclusion that people become such damned fools over their pets that they care little if at all about the rights of others, and nothing short of a strict ordinance will keep the situation under control. When I was a boy here, with great open spaces between houses, things were different, but San Diego is built up now and needs big town control; we must tighten up on this dog and cat nuisance.

There are enough necessary annoyances incident to city life without having to put up with an entirely unnecessary dog and cat pestilence. Perhaps a tax of \$50 per head on these varmints would ease the situation and help prune the crop.

cc..Mr Ed Law  
City Prosecutor

Yours in sorrow,

(Sgd) Frank B Bennett

FBB CN

RECEIVED  
CIVIC CENTER  
JUL 30 1947

COPY



# RYAN AERONAUTICAL COMPANY

LINDBERGH FIELD, SAN DIEGO 12, CALIFORNIA, U.S.A.

CABLE: RYANCO, SAN DIEGO

July 24, 1947

Mr. Jean F. DuPaul  
City Attorney  
City of San Diego  
Civic Center, San Diego, California

Dear Mr. DuPaul:

It was with a great deal of interest and gratification that I read a short article in yesterday's Union stating that your office is preparing a new ordinance to deal with the dog problem in San Diego.

Judging from newspaper articles from time to time, it appears that the dog owners in San Diego are well organized and that they have successfully opposed drastic regulation of their pets and few of the rest of the citizens have voiced opinions. Now is as good a time as any to voice my opinion of the situation.

We have found that owners of dogs without regard for the rights of others have permitted their pets to roam about the community, injuring persons, destroying property and making the nights miserable for light sleepers and invalids.

Perhaps you and the City Council will receive objections to the proposed ordinance. Your answer should be that the failure to respect the rights of others has brought this action. Citizens have the right to live in peace and quiet, to walk the streets in safety and to expect their property rights be respected. Dog owners have consistently interfered with these rights. Those who oppose the proposed ordinance seek to place their selfish interest above the common good.

When we last returned to San Diego after living in the country we disposed of our dog because we found it bothered others and we felt it unfair to the dog to restrict its life in the city.

Your continued efforts on behalf of the citizens of San Diego is appreciated.

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

Very sincerely yours,

1947 JUL 24 8 59 AM

*John D. Hill*

JDH:j

RECEIVED  
CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
CIVIC CENTER

DOCUMENT No. 376313

Filed AUG 5 1947

FRED W. SICK, City Clerk  
By Clark M. Foote, Deputy  
City Clerk

By Deputy

COMMUNICATION

FROM

Residents relative to  
proposed ordinance  
regulating the keeping  
of Dogs

(For the ordinance)