

San Diego. Aug 1

Dear Councilmen.

The newspapers say you are flooded with dog mail, so here is mine.

~~spot for~~ you are in a tight spot surely; you stand to lose the dog vote if you restrict their liberty, yet some of us mere humans will have to move to some town where we can get some sleep, a thing even the Chamber of Commerce did not guarantee us when they wrote the luscious ads that enticed us to San Diego. Some of us have even attempted to raise a few flowers and a lawn around our homes but soon discovered that the neighborhood dogs had prior rights, just as they have to the Balboa Park grass along Sixth Avenue. They can

scatter as much disease breeding
~~filth~~ filth while their owner
holds them on a leash as
run loose. so the park or
the little lawn around the
Public Library still are really
for the benefit of dogs.

A dog's fawning at his
master's feet and barking at
any stranger, especially if
shabbily dressed or a cripple
on crutches or cane, or even
sinking his teeth in anyone
he doesn't take a fancy to,
is called "fidelity" by dog
worshippers, who are of course
persons who cannot get along
with humans; they are the
defeated, ingrown natures who
are disappointed with life.

Let's have a law making one
complaint against a dog nuisance
send him to be obliterated.

M. G. Spanglen



San Diego Bulldog Club

San Diego, California

September 30, 1948

Dog Welfare League,
Mrs E.H. Dowell,
1453 2nd St.
San Diego, California

Dear Mrs Dowell;

The proposed ordinances governing dogs were read and discussed at our monthly meeting, Tuesday night, September 28th and it was moved and unanimously carried that our membership support the Dog Welfare League ordinance.

We would be unalterably opposed to the City Board and through it, the City of San Diego going into the business of selling dogs. We feel a law permitting city employees of the pound to engage in such activities could become a vicious racket and promote the theft of dogs for the purpose of resale.

Thanking you for your sincere interest and hardwork in behalf of better dog legislation, we are,

very truly yours;
San Diego Bulldog Club,

Margaret L. Risgrave
Sec'y



San Diego Bulldog Club

San Diego, California

September 30, 1948

City Concil,
San Diego, California

Dear Sirs;

Enclosed is a copy of a letter sent to the Dog Welfare League in regards to the dog ordinance appearing on the November Ballet.

There should be laws governing dogs in the City of San Diego but feel the ordinance proposed by the Dog Welfare League would be the ordinance we would like to see on our November Ballet.

Sincerely;
San Diego Bulldog Club,

Margaret L. Bisgrove
Sec'y

Margaret L. Bisgrove
4062 46th St.
San Diego, California

RECEIVED
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

SEP 1 11 42 AM 1948

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

FRANK O. WELLS

LICENSED
REAL ESTATE BROKER
Insurance Agent

Phone Jackson 7130

4367 Arista Drive
San Diego, California

August 2nd, 1947

Fred A. Rhodes, City Manager,
Civic Center,
San Diego, California.

Dear Sir:-

Regarding the proposed NEW ordinance; "Regulating the keeping of dogs" which would require the leashing of dogs when not confined to the home and prohibiting the barking of dogs.

Such an ordinance, if passed, would be certainly inhumane, unreasonable and asinine: INHUMANE in that dogs kept on unfenced premises would have to be tied unless kept indoors, I know of several instances when dogs have choked themselves to death by winding their leashes around objects and it is not uncommon for owners, when away from home, to tie their dogs where there is no shade and without water. This ordinance, if passed, would be unreasonable and asinine as to prohibiting their barking, it is as natural for a dog to bark as for a human to speak. I do grant that a dog should be prohibited from long and constant barking at night that would disturb the peace of the neighborhood but when a watch dog on guard warns his owner of approaching danger by barking then such an ordinance is UNREASONABLE AND ASININE.

This new ordinance is unworkable and dangerous in that it will antagonize at least 35000 dog owners in the City and when multiplied by three (which is the average family) then this amounts to 105000 who will be subject to the whims and caprice of his neighbor and this in turn will mean many daily infractions of the law which will swamp your Police Courts for many of these infractions will be entirely unintentional and unavoidable, creating neighborhood antagonisms which will increase and develop into dangerous situations.

I would favor an ordinance making it a violation for an owner to selfishly allow his dog to break the peace of the neighborhood from 9 P.M. to 7 A.M. by long and constant barking, and also for an owner to allow his dog to disturb, create a nuisance or destroy the premises of another.

May I suggest that any of the above infractions be corrected by serving the owner of the dog, causing this infraction, with a ticket similar to a traffic violation and if found guilty to be fined one to five dollars.

It seems to me that the above suggested corrections could be added to the ordinance now in effect and correct, satisfactorily, the present unsatisfactory conditions causing complaints and yet leave the law-abiding owner the right to exercise his dog under control and reduce the danger of biting which in turn reduces the cost to the Health Department for suspicious rabies.

Very sincerely,



Frank O. Wells.



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
ZONE 1

OFFICE OF
THE CITY MANAGER

November 5, 1948

*To the Honorable Mayor and City Council
of the City of San Diego, California.*

Gentlemen:

Returned for filing, without comment, is document 392 816, copy of letter from San Diego Bulldog Club to Dog Welfare League supporting proposed new ordinance.

Respectfully,

F. A. Rhodes
City Manager

R:C

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
NOV 8 2 50 PM '48

334421

DOCUMENT. NO.

NOV - 8 1948

FILED

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

Communication
from City Manager
Returning S. D.
Bulldog Club
letter re proposed
new Ord.

Blase

Down

filed

NOV 10 1948