



THE EATON SPECIAL GUN \$10.00

A safe, close shooting gun that is better by far than the price usually brings. It is fitted with the Greener Cross Locking Bolt, which prevents gun flying open. Extra heavy breech makes smokeless powder a safe load. Our Catalogue shows cut and gives full description. We will be pleased to mail you our new Catalogue free on request.

On pages 229 and 231 of our Fall Catalogue you will find a full assortment of ammunition, shells and supplies of every sort required by the hunter or trapper.

THE T. EATON CO. LIMITED
WINNIPEG CANADA

The Gun You Want Is in the Eaton Catalogue

Get a copy of our Fall and Winter Catalogue and make your choice from among over twenty models of English and American manufacture. If you want a thoroughly reliable gun, the Eaton Catalogue will guide you in making a proper selection, and you will know that you are buying at lowest price.

Stevens
L. C. Smith
Ithaca
Hopkins and
Allen
Marlin
Winchester
Remington
Ross
Savage
and English
makes



prosperous and fertile district.

Interest was not all in the live animals, as shown by the large number of entries in the various classes of farm produce, unexcelled in the larger exhibitions. Then in the home manufacture and fine arts a person could put in a whole day looking over the ladies' department of the show, viewing the bread and butter and other exhibits. In teams the winners were: Heavy draft, C. Craig; agricultural, A. Warren; general-purpose, G. Lidster; carriage, Thos. Irwin; roadsters, R. Lelond.

G. R.

THE FISHERIES DISPUTE

One of the most important cases that was ever argued before an international court is being tried now by the court at The Hague. It is the long-standing dispute between Great Britain and the United States as to the rights of the latter to fish in Newfoundland waters. Once or twice it has brought the two nations almost to the verge of war, and has been a matter of contention between these countries since the United States became independent. A review of the questions involved is interesting.

They are varied and important. The liberties conferred by the treaty of 1818 were ceded to the "inhabitants" of the United States. The first point to be decided is what is meant by the word "inhabitants." Can vessels flying the American flag employ fishermen not alone residing in the United States, but who may be shipped in Canadian ports or on the high seas off the Newfoundland seaboard, beyond territorial jurisdiction? Newfoundland holds that none but genuine "inhabitants" of the Republic residing in that country and shipped at an American port can be employed, while America takes the position that the flag covers all who may be on board, and that if a ship has her proper papers it is not within the competence of the British or colonial governments to inquire into the nationality of those who may make up her crew.

The second point that arises is what is meant by the liberty to take fish "in common" with British subjects. Does

it give the Americans the same rights in every respect as are enjoyed by the colonists, and if so, does it render Americans liable to the same obligations as are imposed upon British subjects by the colonial fishery laws? In other words, are American fishing vessels and their crews, operating in Newfoundland waters, bound by the local regulations that may be made from year to year by the island parliament? Newfoundland contends that they are so bound, but the United States maintains that any such regulations must be by joint agreement, dictated solely with the object of preserving the fisheries, as if the colony were conceded the right to make regulations of itself, it could so frame them as to destroy the value of the liberties granted to American subjects by treaty.

The third question arising is as to whether inhabitants of the United States are required to report at the custom-houses, pay light or other duties, or be subject to any similar regulations. Newfoundland contends that for the maintenance of her rights of sovereignty, the prevention of smuggling and the carrying out of ordinary jurisdictional powers, she is entitled to require that vessels of every nationality entering her waters must report at custom-houses, and, as they participate in the benefits of her lighthouses and other service should pay light and harbor and similar dues, whereas the United States maintains that American fishing vessels are under no such obligations.

The fourth question is as to where the three marine miles off the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbors, mentioned in the treaty of 1818, are to be measured from. This raises once more the whole "headland" question on which there will doubtless now be a definite pronouncement. Britain, as a general thing, maintains that territorial jurisdiction extends seaward for three miles from a line drawn from the outer headlands, no matter how wide the bay that is enclosed may be, and under the exercise of this regulation in bygone days American fishing vessels were seized for fishing in the Bay of Fundy, which is sixty miles across. The

United States, on the other hand, maintains that the three-mile limit should follow the sinuosities of the coast, though in actual practice American authorities did not apply this construction to Boston, New York, and Delaware bays, or other wide inlets on the Atlantic coast.

The fifth question involved is whether Americans have the right to take fish in the bays, harbors and creeks of Newfoundland and the Magdalen Islands, as they admittedly have on the coast of Labrador. Newfoundland maintains that they have not, on the ground that the differing phraseology implies a difference in the liberties conceded, whereas the United States contends that the admitted practice since the treaty of 1818 was negotiated has been for Americans to fish in these inlets.

Such is the international problem that presents itself for solution at The Hague, and its determination will remove the last serious issue that exists between Great Britain and the United States.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

GENERAL

Questions of general interest to farmers are answered through our columns without charge to bona-fide subscribers. Details must be clearly stated as briefly as possible, only one side of the paper being written on. Full name and address of the enquirer must accompany each query as an evidence of good faith but not necessarily for publication. When a reply is required by mail one dollar (\$1.00) must be enclosed.

OWNERSHIP OF LAND—ROAD ALLOWANCE

1. My homestead contains 139 acres odd, the remaining 21 acres supposed to be covered by water. Part of this 21 acres has become dry. To whom does this part belong? If not to me how should I proceed to procure same?

2. A C. P. R. one-quarter section which was covered by water at the time of survey is now partly dry land. I wish

to procure this land. To whom does it belong and how should I proceed?

3. In putting road allowance around a lake and through my one-quarter section have the municipality the right to cut me off from water?

4. If said road allowance goes through my pasture have the municipality to fence both sides of road?—NOMEN.

Ans. 1.—This will depend on the crown grant. If the crown grant is for 160 acres, when the water dries off the land it will belong to you. If the crown grant is for only 139 acres, then the 21 acres will remain the property of the government. If it is the property of the government, the proper method for you to adopt, is to communicate with the Minister of the Department of the Interior at Ottawa, and arrange to procure the remaining 21 acres from the crown. He will inform you what course to pursue.

2. A letter addressed to the land commissioner of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company at Winnipeg, will obtain the necessary information.

3 and 4. We do not know what right the municipality would have for putting a road allowance in any other place than that allowed by the government. It will be necessary to ascertain where they get their rights from. We should advise consulting a local solicitor on this point. You should bear in mind the fact that if you allow the public to continuously make use of a road over your land, that although they may not have any legal right at the present time, they will in the course of time obtain one and can compel you then to allow them to use a right-of-way over your property irrespective of the present legal position.

TRANSFERRING PROPERTY TO WIFE

What is the legal proceedings necessary for a man to make over to his wife—property—such as horses, cattle, etc., such property to be legally held by her?—A. M.

Ans.—The proceedings necessary to take are to have a properly drawn bill of sale, which should be registered. A bill of sale of this kind can only be lawfully given if your inquirer is perfectly solvent, and the giving of such property will not make him insolvent.

CUTTING NEW SEEDING OF RYE GRASS

I sowed a small patch of summer-fallow to Western rye grass the past spring. It has come up very patchy, but is heading out well. Should this be mowed over and left on ground, or can the hay be taken this year? It has been very late growing. It was sowed May 24th.—R. Y. GRASS.

Ans.—You do not say whether or not the rye grass was sown with grain crop, but we presume it was not. Grass seeded alone on good soil that has been well prepared should form a good top the first season. You will have to use judgment as regards cutting for hay. If it is very long and heavy it would not do to cut it and let it stay there, as it would destroy the grass in places. If you can turn stock in why not use it for pasture, not allowing them to eat it off too bare? Otherwise a good plan would be to scatter more seed on the bare places, run the mower over where it needs cutting and gather up where you consider it is worth while. If the bare places are large it will pay to run the harrows over after scattering the seed. Of course the grass will do itself no harm if allowed to stand. If you decide to use the mower don't wait any longer than you can help.

KILLING COUCH GRASS

I have a field under summerfallow. The land is fairly new, only having had four crops, and I find that it contains a very considerable quantity of couch grass in places. I disced the field about May 20 and plowed about June 25. I am now told the discing was a mistake, as the roots should not be cut up. I shall be obliged to plow it again in the fall, as buckwheat plants are too strong to kill with the harrows.

I am advised to be careful not to spread it about the field in harrowing, but I cannot attempt to harrow the patch containing the couch grass alone



MANITOBA, ONTARIO AND NORTH DAKOTA, COMPETED AT WINNIPEG FOR THE BEST TEN HORSES FROM ONE PROVINCE OR STATE. MANITOBA WON