

The Sheep Protection Act.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

Sir,—I have read several articles in the "Advocate" pertaining to sheep-worrying, and I regret to state that I have had some experience with the dog nuisance. In the autumn of 1899, we had eight sheep and four lambs killed during the night. I was awakened by the dogs barking, and saw the dogs, but could not swear who owned them, it being too dark. To prevent a recurrence, I went to the Township Council and drew their attention to the existence of an act passed A.D. 1890, C. 62, page 142. The reeve said he would consult their solicitor, and by all means have said act enforced. But instead of doing so, he had a by-law framed and passed to prevent collection of dog tax. I then obtained advice re its being legal, which was in effect as follows:

Every municipality in the Province must collect the dog tax (except where a by-law has been passed setting aside said tax). If the assessor has neglected to assess the dogs he is liable to the municipality. If he has assessed the dogs and the clerk neglected to extend the figures to their proper column then the clerk is liable, but in no case can the person suffering loss not recover from the municipality. But the municipality can recover from either the assessor or clerk who has neglected his duty, together with all costs.

In every municipality in Ontario, should a ratepayer have any sheep destroyed by dogs, the municipal corporation is liable for two-thirds of their value. But in no case is the municipality liable where the owners of the dog or dogs are known. You must sue the parties, and if you cannot recover by distress, then the corporation must pay you two-thirds of your claim, and all costs. R.S.O. 1887, C. 214, S. 17.

We, in Ontario, have a good act for the protection of sheep, because the owner of pure-bred sheep can recover two-thirds their value from the municipality, and, through the municipality, the difference between that and full value from the owner of the dog (when discovered) which may kill them or in any way affect their value, by tearing or wounding. The money collected for a dog-tax, and not required to pay for sheep destroyed by dogs, becomes an asset of the municipality, and may be used as a general fund of the corporation. R.S.O. 1887, C. 214, S. 7.

Section 2 of the act should be amended or repealed; it reads: "Upon the petition of twenty-five ratepayers the council of any municipality may provide by by-law, that the said tax shall not be levied in said municipality."

If the councillors (or other representatives) have no consideration for the sheep industry of the township, and respect the petition of twenty-five ratepayers (the majority of whom may be sports or dog fanciers), then the sheep industry is not receiving the protection that was intended when said act was framed. T. J. G.

Russell County, Ont.

[Editorial Note.—Our correspondent is substantially correct for the most part in his statements of statute law. It is well, however, to point out that there may be municipalities in the Province of Ontario wherein sheep-owners cannot collect through the municipality for losses sustained from injuries to sheep by dogs, even where a dog tax is collected, for by section 8 of the R.S.O. (1897), Chap. 271, the council of any municipality may maintain the tax and yet, by by-law, dispense with the application of the proceeds thereof to the payment of such losses.

The Act for the Protection of Sheep and to Impose a Tax on Dogs (which is the statute above referred to), gives owners of sheep certain remedies, and provides certain facilities for recovery of compensation for losses, beyond what are afforded by the common law. It gives him the right to kill any dog which he sees pursuing, worrying or wounding any sheep; or any dog without lawful permission in any enclosed farm field, which he finds giving tongue and terrifying any sheep; or any dog which he finds straying, between sunset and sunrise, on any farm whereon any sheep or lambs are kept. But no dog so straying, which belongs to or is kept by the occupant of adjoining premises, or is securely muzzled, or accompanied by, or within call, of any person having charge of it, can legally be so killed, unless there is reasonable apprehension that if not killed it will pursue, wound or terrify sheep then on such farm. And in case of damage to sheep from dogs, provision is made for the killing of the dog by order of a Justice of the Peace, and also for proceeding before a Justice against the owner or keeper of a dog so injuring sheep, for the recovery of damages in a summary way. The act also makes the provision already alluded to, for recovery from the municipality in cases where the sheep-owner is unable to enforce the order made by the Justice in his favor, provided it be a municipality wherein a dog tax is levied and the proceeds kept to be applied to the purpose.]

Canada's Interest in Australia.

To the Editor "Farmer's Advocate":

Sir,—I have yours of June 30th. First, as to the lines on which trade is developing between Canada and Australia. The trade fluctuates in accordance with the changing conditions of the two countries, but mainly in accordance with the ability of the Canadian exporters to fill orders



SUMMER HILL MEMBER.

Yorkshire boar. Winner of second prize in yearling class at Toronto Exhibition, 1902. Weight at 22 months, 670 pounds. BREED BY D. C. FLATT & SON; OWNED BY F. C. SMITH, NEW HAMBURG, ONT.

and the enterprise put into the business. The direct Australian exports to Canada are small and at present insignificant. At the best, they consisted of some frozen mutton, butter and Tasmanian apples to British Columbia, and a few fur skins, hides and a little wool to Eastern Canada. Indirectly, they are more. Canadians buy Australian wool in London, and Australian skins in New York. In the latter case the skins are carried by Canadian railways past the doors of Canadian fur manufacturers to New York, and are there bought and brought back again. It seems improvident to pay expenses in New York and double freights, but the Canadians seem to like it that way. The exports from Canada are much more varied. The products of Canadian farms sent here are flour, wheat, a little oatmeal, peas; cheese, hams and bacon, and occasionally fruit green, dried and canned, seeds. Some of these lines could be increased and others at opportune times sent here, such as oats, butter, potatoes and onions.

You have not space for the reasons why they are not, but mainly it is because the Canadian wishes the Australian to come to Canada, buy and pay for the goods there, and the Australian desires that the goods should be sent out and sold here. In the meantime, while these two cautious peoples are waiting and doing nothing, the Californian sends the stuff over and supplies the market. If Canada expects to do an export trade she must pursue the policy of other nations and do her own business.

The custom returns show about one hundred



VIEW ON THE FARM OF MR. J. V. COOPER, PRINCE EDWARD CO., ONT.

other lines in large or small quantities imported from Canada. British Columbia sends timber and fish, fresh, salted and canned. Eastern Canada, agricultural machines and implements; cotton goods, white, gray and colored; bicycles; boots and shoes; carriages and carriage materials; furniture; India-rubber goods; pianos, organs and other musical instruments; silk goods;

engines and machinery; plaster of Paris; ammunition; surgical instruments and dental goods; typewriters and typesetting machines; steel shingles and metal plates for roofing and interior of houses; leather hollow-ware, woodenware, etc.

Second: The classes of live stock making most progress and likely to do so. Just now, owing to the drought, none but those that in the past and that are likely to in the future are sheep, cattle, horses and swine, in the order named, with a probability that with the increase in dairying, horses and swine will change positions. Australians have displayed remarkable skill in the improvement of wool-bearing sheep, particularly Merinos. The average weight of fleece has been increased over 50 per cent. in 20 years.

Third: You ask for "The classes of animal and other products," the exports of which to Great Britain are on the increase."

Just now, owing to the drought, as above stated, practically none, but to go back to a series of years first wool. Australia is essentially a pastoral country, and is mainly devoted to the production of wool. The following table of exports will show how rapidly trade has grown:—

WOOL EXPORTED.	Lbs.
1861.....	75,019,800
1871.....	175,169,400
1881.....	361,346,700
1891.....	674,205,600

Then, owing to drought and other causes, a decline set in and the amount declined. New South Wales in 1891 contained more than half the sheep of Australia, but does not reach that figure now. In 1891 its wool clip was valued at £11,036,018; in 1900 the value fell to £7,632,213. In 1891 it had 61,831,416 sheep, to-day the drought has reduced the number to less than half that figure. Great Britain is not the only buyer of wool, but she is practically the only buyer of meat (frozen and canned), tallow, butter and wheat, hides and skins and apples from Tasmania, the other products of the land exported. A little cheese has been exported, but its production has not increased so rapidly as that of butter, which has proven most profitable. It must be remembered that I am not speaking of New Zealand, but of Australia and Tasmania only. The butter produced in the New South Wales factories increased five-fold from 1891 to 1900. The total production of Australia in that year was 112,401,496 pounds.

Lastly: The lines of agriculture the governments are seeking to stimulate. As yet the Commonwealth Government has done nothing in this respect, and the work is likely to be left to the State Governments. The lines vary in the different States. In Queensland much attention is given to the production of sugar and tropical and semi-tropical fruits; New South Wales to butter; in South Australia to wine, and in Tasmania to apples and small fruits. In all the States there is a disposition to break up the large holdings used as stations in the fertile districts to induce closer settlement. This means in the end mixed farming as in Canada. The progress has been disappointing. The Australian is a born grazer, and slow to learn the necessity of growing and storing feed for his stock and hand feeding them.

The stock in the very best districts in the dry, hot times, or in the winter, are often in a wretched condition, and there are more of these seasons in ten years in Australia than there are winters in these years in Canada. The country at these times will be as desolate as the fields in Canada at midwinter. A large cheese producer told me he had been looking up the Canadian figures and was surprised to find that the average Canadian cow produced twice as many pounds of cheese per annum as did the average of his herd.

Australia has done great things in improving her sheep, but much can yet be done for her other stock. To have cast an imputation of this sort upon the Australian horse would once have been deemed here to be equivalent to blasphemy.

but the South African war has taught the breeders that while they have produced speedy sprinters, they are after all going to weeds. I believe that Canada could supply pure-bred stock in horses, cattle and pigs which would much improve the stock of this continent. L.

Office of the Commercial Agency,
Australia, Sept. 29, '02. Canadian Government.