

### THE TREATMENT OF STRAY DOGS.

#### *A Plea for Their Preservation from the cruel Dog Catcher.*

#### LOVE REWARDED BY DEATH!

AN ARTICLE WRITTEN FROM THE  
STANDPOINT OF THE DOG.—  
INDIVIDUAL TREATMENT.

An interesting correspondence is reported to have recently taken place between his Worship the Mayor and Mr. Commissioner Coatsworth, respecting the treatment of stray canines by the dog-catchers. Into the merits of the question in dispute between these gentlemen, it is no part of the purpose of this article to enter. This, like most other matters of opinion, no doubt, is one upon which even wise men may differ. So far as we are aware neither science, philosophy, nor religion has defined with any degree of precision the rights of this class of our fellow creatures, nor to what extent we, in the exercise of our lordship over our humbler brethren, are bound to respect those rights. Most of us have, indeed, a sort of dim perception that even dogs have a common origin with ourselves. Even those of us who are old-fashioned enough to believe in the doctrine of creation, have to admit that the hand that made the man made his dog also. It is not necessary for us to be Darwinians in order to be able to grasp this truth. And if it be true, as some people would have us believe, that to be a creature of God is to be His child, the former of these relations being the equivalent of the latter, it is not quite easy to see how we can evade the conclusion that the Fatherhood of God—we write it reverently—extends even to dogs. There is a class of religionists who find great comfort in the Scriptural quotation, "Have we not all one Father?" But, on this hypothesis, Tiney and Tray have as good a right to shelter themselves under

this fragment of Holy Writ as the man who claims to be their owner, and who exercises absolute lordship over them. If there is any difference between the dog and his master, evidently it is not to be found in their origin or descent, but in the super-added element of a spiritual nature in the case of a man and in the facts of Redemption and the New Birth.

Darwinianism, if it be true, even serves to illustrate and confirm the natural relationship between men and dogs. Embryology teaches us that up to a somewhat advanced stage in their pre-natal development the man is not distinguishable from his humbler relative; and if, as the Darwinians think, this makes the line of ascent by which the nobler animal has reached his present exalted status, surely it furnishes a good reason why we should not forget the hole of the pit from which he was dug, neither carry himself too loftily even in the presence of dogs. A witty American is credited with the saying that "there is a good deal of human nature in some men;" and this might be affirmed with almost equal truthfulness of some dogs. There is almost as strongly marked an individuality among them as there is among their masters. No two of them appear to be cast precisely in the same mould. They differ in their leading traits of character almost as much as men do, some of them being grave and some gay, some with a remarkable development of the social characteristics, and others are born cynics and recluses, preferring, like Diogenes, to live in their own tubs and mind their own business. But however widely they may differ from one another in these and many other respects, there is one characteristic which they all seem to possess in common—the strength of their affection, and their consequent fidelity to their friends. All dog lore is full of illustrations of this. It furnishes material for one of the most interesting, thrilling