

March 16.

Wolves, Poachers Blamed in Attack On Deer-Dog Ban

**Sam Harris, However,
Urges That Regulation
Be Given Trial and
Suggests Check on
Hunters Going North**

THOSE OPPOSED SUGGEST FEES

Wolves and poachers—not hunters with dogs—were blamed for the great slaughter of deer in Ontario by delegates from all over the Province in attendance at Committee on Fish and Game at Queen's Park yesterday. Severe criticism of the law which banned dogs was almost unanimously voiced by speakers—alone in opposition to these views being Sam Harris, former President of the Canadian National Exhibition, who appeared as a private citizen.

All through a morning session and into late afternoon the House Committee heard a dozen spokesmen representing game and fish protective associations voice their claims of how the very law that sought to protect the deer was, in effect, bringing about a larger decrease in the herds than could ever come with organized hunting expeditions using dogs.

Question of Management.

Rising against the wave of opposition to the law, Mr. Harris pleaded that the regulation be given a three or four year trial. He declared that every hunter, like himself, was 100 per cent. for conservation, but differed as to the means to bring it about. He urged that the hinterland be preserved as a great playground, and asserted that if Ontario wild life was depleted the tourist trade would suffer immeasurably. He suggested that the whole question was not one of dogs, but of management by the department in controlling the areas and passing upon the type of hunter who went North.

While the dog men fought the law, they agreed that a license fee be placed upon every dog used, and it was urged that only dogs of hound strain be allowed, with police dogs and Airedales strictly prohibited. Then it was asserted and again denied, that dogs brought out mainly the bucks and left the does and fawns back of the chase. But more than one speaker stated that the killing of does and fawns had increased and the slaughter of bucks lessened since still-hunting entirely replaced the dog-hunter.

Use Fees for Protection.

Suggestions for more refuges and preserves, patrolled the year around by department wardens, were also made. Stop the poaching in the preserves and give the deer a chance to breed; license dogs and use revenue to protect these areas, advocated C.

J. Russell of Waubaushe. Mr. Russell denied a statement that deer had been wiped out in the Georgian Bay District.

Elmer Davis, Kingston, made a most forceful plea for use of dogs, declaring that the number of wounded deer lost in the bush alone was a sufficient argument in their favor. "The dog is in the bush only 15 days and the deer is there 365 days," he pointed out, saying that the wolf was the most destructive force. He decried the idea of giving the law a chance for a few years, as so many older men would never again have an opportunity to hunt, not being able to tramp the bush in still-hunts.

William Gastle, Fruitland, made a case against the wolf. "The wolf is the great killer we have to contend with—deer cannot escape the wolf in the snow—and in the hunting season any deer can travel four miles to one by a dog, and is therefore not tortured by the dog, as it is claimed," he declared.

W. J. Moody, Kitchener, suggested that a tax be put on dogs; that if does and fawns were accidentally shot, they be allowed taken by the hunter, who would pay a \$5 penalty instead of leaving them in the bush; and advocated a \$4 license fee for settlers so that they could legally sell deer to hunters.

C. K. Gregg, Renfrew, a veteran of the bush who has hunted deer for 56 years, told the committee that, while he was content to be a still-hunter himself, he defended the use of dogs. Dr. C. B. Taylor, St. Thomas, and Norval Lynn, Welland, both expressed opinions favoring dogs, the latter saying that he knew of personal knowledge that more does and fawns were being brought down than bucks since dogs were barred.

Major suggestions laid before the committee by the Ontario Hunters' Game Protective Association included a \$40 wolf bounty, a \$50 fee for non-resident hunters, an open season for ruffed grouse and spruce partridge in 1933, a \$1 fee for hunters' dogs, and severe penalties for infractions of game laws.

The committee will reconvene this morning at 9.30 to hear anglers.

INCREASE IS SHOWN IN CIVIL SERVICE

6,928 Employed in 1929
and 7,950 Last Year,
Says Premier

\$25,975 TO CUT TREES

The number of employees in the Ontario Civil Service has increased from 6,928 in 1929 to 7,950 in 1932, according to information given in the Legislature yesterday by Premier Henry in answer to a question placed on the order paper by J. A. Sangster (Liberal, Glengarry).

In 1929 there were 2,117 inside civil employees and 4,811 outside; in 1930, there were 2,194 inside and 5,233 outside; in 1931, there were 2,271 inside and 5,464 outside; while last year the total was 2,312 for inside employees and 5,448 for those outside.

The position of Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board is a full-time job, but the Chairman still carries on as an adviser to a benevolent association, T. K. Slack (Progressive, Dufferin) was informed. His receipts for this advisory service during the past three years totalled \$1,600.

The total amount advanced to the T. & N.O. Railway to date is \$30,207,934, and the Government has been paid \$15,088,245 to date by the railway, Premier Henry informed R. A. Baxter (Liberal, Oxford South). The amount of \$25,975 was spent for cutting and trimming trees on the King's Highways during the last fiscal year, Hon. Leopold Macaulay informed W. J. Bragg (Liberal, Durham).

Attorney-General Price informed T. A. Blakelock (Liberal, Halton) that the profit of the Liquor Control Board for the fiscal year ending Oct. 31, 1931, was \$8,491,663, as compared with \$6,632,424 for the same period last year. There was \$10,875,000 turned over to the Government for the fiscal year 1931, and \$9,905,000 for the last fiscal year.

In reply to a query of Hon. H. C. Nixon as to when a pronouncement might be expected on the Dorland matter, Colonel Price stated that he understood the Police Commission was still taking evidence.

"Does that apply to the administration of justice or police matters?" pursued Mr. Nixon.

"They are cleaning up the matter before the Police Commission, and I am waiting until that is done," replied Colonel Price.