

animals of other people off my farm. I believe a better class of stock would be kept if cattle were prevented running at large."

On the whole, it seems difficult to arrive at any other conclusion than that a stock law, whether local or general, to be thoroughly effective, should be directly prohibitory, that there should be no exemptions whatever, and that the duty of prosecuting should be handed over to a competent salaried officer, with the understanding that he is to do his duty independent of all local influences.

To sustain this opinion it is fortunately not necessary to travel outside of our own domain. While, as has been before stated, the stock laws now existing in the Province, and based on well-designed legislative enactments, are almost wholly inoperative, nevertheless there are localities where these laws have been effectively and beneficially enforced. In addition to the Township of Blanshard, in Perth County, already adverted to, North Cayuga (County of Haldimand) has a law providing that "any person, after being notified either verbally or in writing, who shall, twenty-four hours after receiving such notice, wilfully allow or permit any animal, his or her property, or in his or her possession, to run at large contrary to the requirements of this by-law, shall forfeit or pay a fine of not less than \$1, or more than \$5, upon conviction thereof before a Justice of the Peace," etc.; but "this shall not interfere with any other remedy or proceeding." In this township it is reported the by-law is operative and convictions have been had. In the Township of East Whitby (County of Ontario), a by-law, than which it is stated none ever enacted by the municipality caused so much excitement, was passed in 1879. It has been productive of the most salutary effect in at least one locality. In the village of Columbus it is strictly carried out, "and," it is added, "the change is manifest in parties starting to beautify the roadsides." In the Township of Westminster (County of Middlesex), where the by-law is reported partially operative, lives a sturdy agriculturist, who determined that, so far as he was concerned, it should not become a nullity. Mr. Thomas Carruthers, of lot 7, concession 5, planted trees in front of his land, and for some years has strictly enforced on his road the law prohibiting the running of animals at large.

There can be no doubt that a good deal can be done by individual effort to make stock laws a real benefit to a community, and, where the desirability is generally acknowledged, it would seem that there ought to be no difficulty in carrying them out in accordance with the spirit of recent legislation, and without further legislative interference. In districts where there is a large area of wild land and few clearings, stock laws are unnecessary; in closely-settled and cleared-up regions their utility must be evident. In the United States, particularly in the West, they have come to be regarded as an important adjunct of civilization.

In New York State they are largely operative, and so popular have they become that gentlemen of experience, from whom reports have been received, declare their belief that fifty persons will be found to approve where only one will condemn, and that it would be impossible to find a legislator from the rural districts who would dare to make an effort to strike them from the Statute Book. Under the operation of these laws the highways and byways of the State have practically become a portion of adjoining farms; the grass is turned into hay, the weeds are checked before their seeds ripen and spread over the fields, shade-trees are planted which require no protection during their early growth, and private residences, heretofore fenced in, are now open to the roadways. The only people opposed to these laws are those who, not being landholders, desire free pasture for cattle on what they had been accustomed to regard as common land. As in some parts of Ontario, an opinion seems to hold that the laws would be even more operative than they are were their provisions simplified and the duty of impounding cattle made incumbent on the overseers of highways, thus obviating the objection that the enforcement of the law by private individuals often engenders ill feeling among neighbours. The opinion is also advanced in some quarters, that with the stock laws should be coupled a rigid enactment for the destruction of noxious weeds on the public roads.

In Ohio it is provided that owners letting cattle, horses, mules, sheep, goats, swine, or geese go astray, shall be liable to a penalty of not less than one nor more