

File No. 6630 Continued.

OFFICE.

nuisance, even though the case involved the necessity of restraining the animals. If no such reproach attaches to their owner, and so far as my knowledge goes I have no reason to believe that it does, Mr. Bourne should be remitted to his private right of redress in the Courts, if he has any. The City has no right to interfere with Mrs. Joy merely upon the ground that the dogs and cats are so numerous, or so obstreperous as to sensibly diminish the peace and comfort of Mrs. Joy's neighbors. So far as the dogs are concerned, I might add that every person owning or harboring a dog within the City limits is required to pay a license fee or tax for each dog to the City, and may be subjected to a fine for not complying with the requirements. (City Code, Pielert's Revision Art. 41, Sec. 21). The City Ordinances relating to dogs will be found compiled in Pielert's Revision, Art. 25, Sec. 10, and Art. 41, Sects. 20-25.

Truly yours,

(Signed) W. Cabell Bruce,

City Solicitor.

File No. 6630.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Baltimore, August 15, 1907.

Mr. W. Cabell Bruce,

City Solicitor.

Dear Sir:-

In reply to yours of recent date, in reference to 2214 McCulloh Street, the "Dog tenement"; I do not think you understand our situation and complaint exactly. If you did you would, no doubt, be more considerate of the matter.

Mrs. Joy keeps her number of dogs housed, from one year's end to another, day and night, living in the house, seldom out doors, and the odor arising therefrom is obnoxious and stifling, and the howling and yelling of those dogs, shut up in the house at night, arouses and awakens us, as also surrounding neighbors, out of sound asleep, thereby breaking our rest and causing a nervous condition of the system continually; and the terrible smell we have to endure, both front and