

# Don't feed them, take them away

A WELL-HEELED gent drives into a neighbourhood, late at night to feed a pack of stray mutts that roam the area as if it's their personal domain.

He never fails to make a grand entrance in his flashy ride, always well-groomed and well-armed with a generous bag of bones in the boot of his car.

While he deludes himself into thinking he is a comic-book, hero-type do-gooder for homeless canines, it is actually quite the contrary, looking at the big picture.

His 'noble' act only attracts more strays, a greater nui-

sance in the neighbourhood with incessant barking, easily-provoked by passers-by.

Dogs are dogs, man's best friend or not. Well-fed, they indulge in irrational barking and menacing behaviour, maybe to please some absentee master. This usually occurs when they are on a full belly as if it's the right thing to do, in appreciation of the sustenance received.

They roam without supervision, poop all over the shore and provoke passers-by into shooing them away with sticks and stones, appearing as if they (the dogs)

are the victims.

On that note, might I enquire of the writer of "*Ticked off for feeding stray-dogs*" (*The Malay Mail*, May 31): If one is truly an animal lover as one claims, then why doesn't one make a concerted effort to get them off the streets and take them to one's home if one truly claims to love them.

Or is that "conditional love" rather than "unconditional". Or perhaps take pains to place them in appropriate shelters instead of creating a nuisance by just feeding them to show all and sundry

that one is a compassionate dog-lover.

Feeding strays may provide temporary relief (from whatever guilt-baggage one is carrying) to the giver but it only adds to the woes to man's four-legged friend.

Yes, the lady was right. One should not only be ticked off, but also fined for prolonging the misery of man's best friend by just feeding them to satisfy a guilt pang rather than have their broader welfare at heart.