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The Humane Movement Should Be Ashamed

How let's look in on another humane society shelter that also kills the unwanted animals with carbon monoxide. We have seen, with our own eyes, a large top-opening box in which the dead animals are left, one on top of the other in neat rows, like sardines stuffed in a can. The box is emptied only once or twice weekly when it becomes full, at least during cold weather! Actually, such a box has its good points. This arrangement is said to be less disturbing to the seals, for the drum is between uses. The box already has some concentration of the gas in it when the seals are lowerened through the top opening. If the gas is from an appropriate engine, cooled and filtered before introduction, the box is probably as humane as any with more aesthetically acceptable disposition of the animals. In answer to a question, the gas was from a late-model automobile, which does not contain the proper concentration of carbon monoxide and is likely to be less enjoyable to the animals.

THE SPACE VEHICLE!

Let's move on now to another humane society shelter also using a carbon monoxide method of disposal. This was a utility room off a utility room, but we do not recall the details. We were told that the gas was filtered and cooled in a water tank through which it passed from an old automobile motor. Nevertheless, when the door to the chamber was opened, it belched blue and black fumes, and the attendants sprang back to get out of the way.

(See ASHAMED, page 2, column 1)
ASHAMED - FROM PAGE 1

We went over to the water tank and opened the door. What came out was something like molasses. Inquiry among the attendants elicited an estimate that the tank was emptied, and refilled with fresh water every month or two.

Far from being grateful to us for discovering this defect in the operation of the tank, the lady president appeared to be incensed, and to resent our suggestions for improving the operation.

THE ELECTROCUTION DEVICE

On up the pike a good piece is a small public pound. It destroys the animals in dribs and drabs. One day they'd mention a rusty metal clamp to the dog's lip, and another to his flank. The other end of this contraption is plugged in the electrical system. When the current is not first passed through the animal's brain to provide immediate unconsciousness, which must take place in electrocution to be considered humane. Only the local dog warden knows how long this dastardly device has been in use at this "shelter," that some devices have been used for years in some processing plants to kill chinchillas, the cute little animals whose skins wind up on the backs of ladybugs.

Services.--Since so many devices for "euthanasia" until recently, have been used at this "shelter," (similar devices for "euthanasia" until recently.

We went over to the water tank and opened the door. What came out was something like molasses. Inquiry among the attendants elicited an estimate that the tank was emptied, and refilled with fresh water every month or two.

Other painful effects of decompression, such as internal pressures experienced when gases cannot rapidly escape from body fluids in the newborn animal continued to accumulate, and in the time required to reach unconsciousness from anoxia, as well as differences in rates of decompression arising from varying deficiencies of the equipment or its operation, nobody can be absolutely sure that unconsciousness from anoxia alone occurs before the painful effects of the bends become operative.

Iowa a Bad One?

Recently we heard from a man in Iowa who reported that the use of succinylcholine chloride, a muscle relaxant, method of "euthanasia" is rampant in that State. Mrs. Edward F. Kopecky, of Cedar Rapids, we salute your dedication and drive! She intends to hold a symposium on euthanasia, or any other "humane problem for that matter.

The particular pound referred to above is located in a county whose officials did not realize they were conducting an inhuman operation. When we sent them a strong letter, we got a curt reply. We reported that the use of succinylcholine chloride, the cute little animals whose skins wind up on the backs of ladybugs. (Pho-

courtesy of the National Association for Humane Legislation (our sister society) had a euthanasia bill introduced in the Maine legislature, vets objected because it would, among other things, ban the use of succinylcholine chloride for killing animals.

If you should have to take your old or sick pet to a veterinarian to be put to sleep, insist on seeing what he uses for this purpose. It might very well be succinylcholine chloride, which is convenient, cheap and easy. It does not require bothersome record keeping like the barbiturates, and causes paralysis, giving the totally false impression that the animal is going quietly to sleep without pain. This process is comparable in physiological effects to the hanging of dogs in Greenland, described in an accompanying article.

The demand for Report Nos. 20 and 21 has been so great that despite a large over-printing we now are out of copies. A summary of these findings was given in Report to Humanitarians No. 31 (March, 1975) and a follow-up in Report No. 36 (June, 1976).

NOT THE BENDS

Nearly everyone has heard about the very painful "bends" to which deep-sea divers and caisson workers are subject if they quickly reach normal atmospheric pressure after being submerged in water greater than normal pressure. The bends are associated with the formation of nitrogen bubbles in the blood and other nitrogen-containing tissues of the body. However, the bends have been found to occur after time intervals which indicate that in most cases animals destroyed in the decompression chamber would have become unconscious before the bends would have time to develop. Moreover, because of differences in the reaction times of humans and animals, the variability between species is in time to the bends in and the time required to reach unconsciousness from anoxia, as well as differences in rates of decompression arising from varying deficiencies of the equipment or its operation, nobody can be absolutely sure that unconsciousness from anoxia alone occurs before the painful effects of the bends become operative.

For adult dogs, it is unlikely that any significant number suffer from the bends during decompression. But with young animals, puppies and kittens resist anoxia. One investigator found that the respiratory center in the newborn animal continued to function 17 times as long as in the adult. This alone could account for the testimony of humanitarians who claim to have witnessed individual animals arising from a batch removed from the chamber after ten or 15 minutes at "high altitude." Undoubtedly, in such cases, the surviving animals do experience pain, and perhaps even the extreme pain of the bends. Other painful effects of decompression, such as internal pressures experienced when gases cannot rapidly escape from body cavities, also would be intensified.

Young Animals Suffer

Young animals never should be destroyed in a decompression chamber. Yet, the latter comes equipped with an attached small cyliner which is decompressed right along with the big one used for adult animals, and apparently is intended for young ani-

mals as well as cats. In many, in instances that you have observed have been any other visible means of destroying these young animals, which almost surely will suffer pain when decompressed?
Sled Dogs in Greenland Hanged by the Neck
And Otherwise Brutally Treated

Humanitarians will have to go a long way to find anything like the cruelty to which sled dogs in Greenland are subjected. (The nearest, probably, would be several thousand miles away in the United States, where many more thousands of dogs are killed annually in ways which have much the same effect as hanging—see article in this issue, "The Humane Movement Should Be Ashamed.")

As the reporter for England's Sunday People wrote, in the dramatic style common to these sensational tabloids:

"The jaws are open in a hideous smile. But the eyes blaze with pain and terror..." Another old tricky is being hanged by the neck until it is dead."

"It's only crime! It grew too old to work. And that's the way they end a dog's life in Greenland.

"It is horrible. It is cruel. For it can take more than five minutes for a dog to die at the end of the rope.

I watched revolted as the creature fought for life, convulsing for five or six minutes before death.... The dog clawed frantically with its forepaws in attempts to escape from the noose, jerking and rotating, its eyes bulging.

"Hanging is a commonplace thing in Greenland. That is the way they put their dogs to death.

And the reason for this barbaric practice? They hang their dogs so that the fur will stand out during the death struggle-literally in hair-raising agony. The skins of dogs killed in this way, with long raised hairs, are more valuable than those with flat hairs.

But even this hanging until death does not satisfy those with a nice regard for the finer points of pelt improvement. Some are said to hang the dog until unconscious, then lower him to the ground, wait until the animal regains consciousness, then hang him again. This may be repeated—three, four or even five times. Each hanging in effect is used as a convenient way of providing "anesthesia" for the tooth extractions.

During the summer months the mature dogs are tethered in the surrounding meadows with steel chains about four yards long. The dogs remain so chained until winter snows fall, being fed usually once a week with dried fish. They become so hungry that they may kill and eat people who are not careful in approaching them.

Some of the dogs get loose and roam the streets of nearby villages and towns. Police shoot them on sight, a relatively merciful end.

The Greenland sled dogs are used only for pulling, and are almost never kept as pets. To the Greenlander, the dogs are merely motor power, akin to a gasoline-driven snowmobile. The fact that they are abused in equally reprehensible ways, and are almost never kept as pets, has served to蒙 them to the dogs never seems to enter their minds. They are utterly insensitive dogs as living creatures.

The almost incomprehensible part of this situation is that Greenland is under the political jurisdiction of Denmark, one of the most advanced countries in the world from the standpoint of treatment of animals. Why does not Denmark do something about it? First, the Greenland authorities deny that dog hangings and the other practices described by the Sunday People are more than isolated instances, despite an impressive array of evidence presented by the reporters. And, secondly, the Greenlanders, like their neighbors, the Danes, are educated, intelligent, stalwart kind of people, and no doubt would not take kindly to being told by Denmark how to conduct their daily lives. Mass protests have occurred in Denmark by humane organizations there, and if anything can be done to halt the practices cited, Denmark is likely to do it.

Our main reason for running this article is not to promote action by American humanitarians, which probably would amount to little more than the usual form of boondoggling anyway. What we want to do is point out that the baby seal kill is only one of many instances in this broad world of animal abuse, and that we could spend all of our time as humanitarians running from one thing to another, merely because they represent conditions which are easily sensationalized. Meanwhile, far greater numbers of animals are abused in equally reprehensible ways, right here in our own homes in the United States, even in our own humane society shelters and publicly-operated pounds. The Greenlanders are not the only people who are "insensitive to dogs as living creatures."

(Photograph from Sunday People.)

RODEOS BANNED—FROM PAGE 5—

are naturally different from ours. Perhaps we could use the same type of approach in combating the opinions of veterinarians on many other subjects, such, as euthanasia. The vet who defends the use of succinylcholine chloride as humane because it works so rapidly is no more capable of making such a decision than a layman who says it is humane because the pain, although for a short time, is intense. The difference in interpretation necessarily is subjective, once the physical effects of the drug are known. And one person's interpretation is just as good as another's.

As we go to press, an attempt is being made by rodeo backers to persuade Council to rescind its decision to ban rodeos in St. Petersburg. This effort is not expected to succeed. An agreement already had been made by the City for a rodeo next February, but the Council will try to ab...
humane movement should be interested in finding and using only methods of "euthanasia" which are as safe and comfortable as possible. We might expect some paid managers or employees of humane society shelters and public pound employees, accustomed with convenience, costs of operation and volume of business than with the humaneness of the method employed. Why so many of them fight against efforts to require sterilization of all animals adopted out of the shelters. They believe it would reduce the "volume of business." Likewise, they don't shy away from the possiblity that "euthanasia" may be painful for a "soft-hearted little old lady:" but the animals have to die, anyway, so what difference can a few seconds make?" Well, it does make a big difference to Humane Information Services, and to most animal lovers who understand the problem. An animal can suffer a lot in only a few seconds, not to mention the pain of an uncertain end. And veterinarians, experience has taught us, frequently seem to be as hard-hearted to non-human animals as they are to their professional ones. They know who butters their bread, who stands behind them in opposition to low-cost euthanasia, and who might want to remold the "emotional little old ladies" whose ideas sometimes get in their hair. So they listen to the old-line shelter managers who resist companies that have "animal lovers" among them. But so many of AvMA's actions in appointing the committee in the first place. Humane Information Services wants to help people equalize sentiment against decompression and other inhumane methods of euthanasia. What better decompression chamber, directly contradicting the AVMA's, support its own position, never examining the evidence objectively. They claim that "it is my understanding that no other (the AVMA) method of decompression has been able to spend the time or money to study these four various methods of euthanasia to insure that they are humane." The major defenses they offer have little or nothing to do with the real questions involved. Their arguments, their arguments even sound plausible. We suspect that most of the efforts to stop the use of a decompression chamber have succeeded can attribute this success to political expediency rather than to concerned minds and genuine animal lovers. Those defenders sound so "scientific." Those who have voted to ban the chamber probably were, in most cases, merely bowing to what they considered to be uninformed public opinion.

"SAVE-A-LIFERS"

What we cannot understand is how and why so many members, directors and unpaid representatives of humane societies, and the general animal-loving public should seem to be so indifferent to the suffering by millions of dogs and cats during "euthanasia" in pounds and other facilities. So much money to "save the baby seals," "save the wild burros," "save the wolves," "save the sea lions" against these fanatical "save-a-lifers," who probably do more harm than good to animals. But there are others, not dyed-in-the-wool "save-a-lifers," who still get desperate about a lot of things, not about euthanasia methods. They are the kind of animal lovers who react rather than think. They see a newspaper ad showing a "save-a-life" phenomenon as the kindhearted old lady who harbors 50 cats in her home under extremely unsanitary and inhumane conditions. So long as she doesn't have to destroy them, everything is fine. At least, the humane move-
On May 19, 1977, the St. Petersburg (Florida) City Council banned rodeo from St. Petersburg. Mayor Greta Bunting, as one Councilman told a reporter friend, had been unmoved for years by the animal rights activists who, she said in our Report to Humanitarians No. 34; December, 1975). A few individual humanitarians opposed the rodeo again in 1976, but two persistent females refused to get the rodeo banned, so long as veterinarians, the SPCA and the ordi­nary humane organizations would join the fight. The SPCA sent a letter to Council after the last two rodeos held at the Bayfront netted a few dollars. The Ro­deo Cowboys Association considered this to be a test case, and sent its highest official to lead the counteroffensive. A representa­tive of the ordi­nary humane organizations, a member of the Florida SPCA, appeared before legislative bodies, and Superinten­dent Frederick Thomsen of the ordi­nary humane organizations would join the fight, it would be a waste of our time and ener­gy to try to get the rodeo banned. So, we considered the matter dead. But two persistent females refused to let the issue alive by writing letters to the local papers and the Mayor. Greta Bunting kept her belt as tight as possible, and in­sisted that Dr. Thomsen ("Doc"), president of Humane Information Services, appear before Council one more time. Meanwhile, several women had been admitted to Council, making the situation a little more hope­ful. So Doc consented to do so.

The SPCA sent another letter to the Florida City Council councilmen, and in­sisted that Frederick Thomsen, the articulate 78-year-old Thomsen said in our Re­port to Humanitarians No. 40 - June, 1977 - Page 5 another rodeo to be held in Bayfront Cen­ter. (2) Another important lesson to be learned from this experience is how to deal with the opinions of veterinarians in such matters. Please understand, we are not down on vets, or even on rodeo fans, as some of our members would like us to do. We disagree with them about spay and neuter campaigns, but not about sub­jects important to humanitarians. We find vets to be one of the most important road­blocks to improvement in euthanasia in shelters and pounds (for example, in Maine they have fought a good euthanasia bill). But many of them are using the same words that Humane Information Services recommends to this approach, rather than the elusive search for some kindhearted understanding of the fact that the vet is not one of the most important road­blocks to improvement in euthanasia in shelters and pounds (for example, in Maine they have fought a good euthanasia bill). But many of them are using the same words that vets are necessary for many aspects of animal care and humane care. (1) The unto­moral definition of "humaneness." The different between humanitarians and veterinarians with respect to the humaneness of rodeo is a matter of subjec­tive judgment, because we each have the same thing happening to the animals. According to the veterinarian's definition of "inhuma­ne," the rodeo is not such. The humani­tarian simply has a different set of sub­jective standards, a different definition. Because of the respected position of the veterinarian, and the financial expert in regard to the physical effects on an­i­mals of different conditions, the veteri­narian is in a sense the authority on the humaneness of rodeo. But vets are accepted and accepted by promoters, public officials and others, although ac­ceptance or rejection is often the key to render such an opinion than is a concerned layman. They probably would agree on what happens to the animals what they do not agree on the significance of the in refer­ence to the definition of humaneness. That is why Doc turn to the dictio­nary for his definition of "humaneness." The stockyard is the only thing more acceptable to the general pub­lic than the opinion of a doctor or veteri­narian, it is the definition of a dictio­nary! And by the dictionary's definition of "inhumane," anyone must admit that this term applies to a rodeo. So, Humane Information Services recom­mends resort to this approach, rather than the elusive search for some kindhearted understanding of the fact that the vet is not one of the most important road­blocks to improvement in euthanasia in shelters and pounds (for example, in Maine they have fought a good euthanasia bill). But many of them are using the same words that
DOLPHIN-KILLING TUNA INDUSTRY AT IT AGAIN!

As we go to press it appears that a re­newed effort by the tuna fishing industry to continue killing the dolphins may suc­ceed.

The $500 million, 140-vessel tuna fish­ing fleet, after being laid up in port for months through international restric­tions on killing dolphins, suddenly put to sea, apparently after receiving as­sent from Congress in January, on the insistence of the Carter Administration, and with the approval of the Senate, to get out a bulletin sug­gestion that this legislation is not the final word on the matter.

The final result of all this should beHumane Legislation, Senate Bill No. 1550, which contains provisions which are similar to those of the amendments proposed through this legislation before the pub­lisher.

The acquisition of a dog for this pur­pose frequently results in great disap­pointment for the purchaser, who frequently are far from being humane. Re­port TO HumaneLEGISLATION will have an anal­ysis of this specific issue.

The final result of this whole objective seems to be rush­ing through this legislation before the pub­lic, including humane societies, knows what is going on. Humanitarians have won­dered why they never can seem to elicit comprehension from anyone in considera­tion of huma­ne legislation!

The tremendous increase in home bur­glaries, rapes, vandalisms and other crimes committed against persons while at home has caused many to feel protected by keeping a dog on the premises.

This article is about dogs owned by ordi­nary houseowners living in private homes or apartments, primarily to provide pro­tection against criminals.

The Humane Society of the United States (ASHAMED) has succeeded in our work far beyond our original expectations. We be­lieve that the fine people who are members of the humane movement, has reached nearly 155,000, and is constant­ly growing.

ASHAMED - FROM PAGE 4
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Answers to Questions About the Effects of the Brown Bill, H.R. 1464, on Kosher Slaughtering Plants

Question 1: If a plant is engaged in both ritual and non-ritual slaughtering, would it have to change its operations in any way, and if so, what would be the effects on costs of operation?

Some large packing plants, including one in Iowa, do a large amount of business in both kosher and non-kosher meat. These plants are also federal inspection plants and also sell meat products to federal government agencies. The ritual and non-ritual slaughter is kept entirely separate, with the former providing the federal humane slaughter of 1958, which exempts all phases of ritual slaughter from the provisions of the act. The non-kosher slaughter at this plant does not follow any ritual slaughtering. The plant owner has a non-shochet who performs this operation in the same way and for exactly the same reasons as the operations of a similar plant that sells meat to the federal government, but does not follow the ritual methods. Therefore, it will not affect the operations of this plant, with respect to either ritual or non-ritual slaughter.

Question 2: A smaller plant located in a Northeastern state also sells meat to both kosher and non-kosher trades, but not to any federal government agency, hence does not now come under the provisions of the 1958 federal act. It runs all of the animals slaughtered through the same slaughtering line, shackling and hoisting the conscious animals whether they be for ritual or non-ritual slaughter. The only difference is that when the animals for ritual slaughter reach the point where they are to be cut and bled out, the cut is made by the shochet, and the carcasses are processed in accordance with the dictates of Jewish ritual. For non-kosher part of the slaughter there is substituted for the shochet a slaughterman with no religious qualifications, since the slaughtering is done by federal humane standards of 1958, which exempts all phases of ritual slaughter from the provisions of the act. The remaining, expensive operations of the kosher plant, involving several workers under the supervision of the "maschikin", are dispensed with.

When the Brown bill becomes law, the ritual slaughtering operations of this plant will not be affected in any way. The animals will continue to be shackled and hoisted while conscious. But for the non-kosher portion of the plant's slaughtering, the same procedures would be followed to make the animals unconscious before shackling and hoisting will be required.

This additional operation, it is believed, can be done without additional help, by the same worker who does the shackling. This might require the use of an insensitive enclosure making it easy for the worker to use the captive bolt pistol. However, it is believed that in keeping mind that the actual shackling of the animal will be made easier and less time consuming when the animal is unconscious. But even if an additional worker is required to do the stunning, this plant would be on an even competitive footing in its non-kosher sales with non-kosher plants, which also would be required to stun the animals before shackling and hoisting.

What effect would the Brown bill have on such a plant? Presumably none so far as the carcasses, or portions of carcasses, of animals killed by the methods of the act are intended for the kosher trade and which therefore cannot carry the kosher marking. This would continue to flow into the non-kosher trade as it is now. It could, however, be of advantage to the plant management to stun the animals before shackling and hoisting, using a non-shochet at a lower hourly wage to make the cut, and avoid the expense of paying a shochet for the kosher part of the operation. It is also possible that the cost of slaughtering animals under the provisions of the 1958 act to non-kosher slaughter in inspected (state as well as federal) plants which do not sell meat to the federal government, might come under much more effective and efficient enforcement. It also would cover imported meat, not now covered. Ritual slaughter is not affected. Since, at present, in plants which already come under the 1958 act, the "trafe" carcasses or portions of carcasses resulting from ritual slaughter are not condemned for human consumption, but pass into the gentile trade, there is nothing in the Brown bill which would change this.

However, any animals intended for the non-kosher trade, with the whole carcasses going into the gentile trade, would under the Brown bill have to be slaughtered under the requirements of the 1958 act. It would eliminate the need for the plant management to stun the animals before shackling and hoisting, using a non-shochet at a lower hourly wage to make the cut, and avoid the expense of paying a shochet for the kosher part of the operation. This would be of advantage to the plant which is interested in the non-kosher trade, and which therefore would not be affected by the Brown bill in any way.
THE NEED FOR MORE COMMUNICATION WITHIN THE HUMANE MOVEMENT

One of the most common themes found in the many welcome letters we receive (and a few not so welcome) is that we are too distant as a movement, too divisional, not working together to achieve a common goal. In fact, one of the reasons humane societies are notorious among other groups, such as legislators, is for being "unable to agree on anything.

This severely limits the potential accomplishments of the humane movement. We find that all over the country, whether in Alaska or in New Orleans, there is an overwhelming desire to work together to effect a general shift to these methods, this disagreeable but highly important phase of humane work could be implemented throughout the country with a single voice.

But what is actually occurring? We find that we are ineffective, with still more offering programs to deal with mutual problems. The elements of such a program are known to all. But the different societies are not in all instances, reasons why one claims the sole solution, others claiming they are ineffective, with still more offering a panacea. The continued lack of measures required to do the job.

Meanwhile, the millions of puppies and kittens continue to be born each year, to become the grounds for the 100,000 plus personal slaughterhouses operated by the very same humane societies which profess to want to eliminate animal suffering.

An example of this was a recent all-day conference, held in the offices of Humane Information Services, in St. Petersburg, of John A. Hoyt, president of the Humane Society of the United States, and Dr. Thoburn, president of Humane Information Services. The discussions covered a wide range of methods of dealing with attacks on humanity, everything, and disagree only on priorities and how our resources can be most effectively used.

Some mutual irritation is bound to arise. But we still stand by our original suggestions to set up a humane society which share our desire for more communication and cooperation within the humane movement to meet with open arms, mind, and heart.

This has worked very well as between the Humane Society of the United States and humane organizations, and we have been far from perfectly, partly because staff members do not always reflect the good intentions and efforts of those they represent. We salute John as a scholar, a gentleman, and a good cooperateur. May our communication and cooperation continue.

PETS LEFT IN HOT CARS

All after the publicity in recent years about not leaving pets in autos in warm weather, few pet owners have not heard of the dangers of this practice. But because they are hard to believe the warnings. The only way to reach these people is to let them know what others think of them. A brief typewritten note, or even a letter, can have influence than a printed leaflet. You may wish to type the message given below, making several carbons, and keep them on hand for when you see a car containing a pet which appears to be too warm. It was kept in the machine, and give your message on the blank below.

We would like to know your reaction to this new approach.

THE PET ANIMAL YOU LEFT IN YOUR CAR SEEMED TO BE SUFFERING FROM THE HEAT.

THOUSANDS OF PET ANIMALS ARE KILLED OR REQUIRE VETERINARY TREATMENT WHEN LEFT IN HOT CARS.

IF THE TEMPERATURE IN THE CAR WOULD FEEL ONLY WARM TO A PERSON, IT MAY BE UNREASONABLY HOT FOR AN ANIMAL.

GUARD DOGS -- FROM PAGE 6

into plenty of burglary insurance, good locks, and burglar alarms.

Those who own dogs primarily to protect the household from potential or actual criminal activity fail to take into account the feelings of the dog. So many so-called "guard dogs" are not only frightened and cruelly mistreated that many humane society shelters will not permit anyone to adopt them. It is far better, perhaps, that we rather see the dog humanely destroyed than go into a "home" of that kind. They have seen too many instances of cruelty to animals at "guard dog" hands.

Does this mean that a household must deny himself the protection afforded by having a dog on the premises? By no means. He must merely go about the whole thing in a different way.

More people are trying to enjoy the joys of raising a dog as a companion than as a "guard.

member of the family to love and be loved by. If he can't feel that way about a dog, he had better forget it. If protection is all, or the acquisition of a dog that appeals to him as a pet but the kind he mistakenly thinks will scare a trespasser.

And he should follow the suggestions of experienced humane society people in acquiring a dog that is both of quality, and non-aggressive, and trainable enough to be a help, not a hindrance.

Other child. It must be given study and thought.

And, finally, the householder should learn to make his pet more than a tenant. He can only be "the" dog to an unwanted pet. They were aided and abetted by the "save-a-lifers" who thought that any home was better than none. This policy has been rapidly changing as humane society leaders have learned to take a broader view of the problem of surplus pets.