

COLLARED!

150 Years of the Dog Act in South Australia

Researched Written and Designed by:

NEIL RANSOM

89/125 Montacute Road

CAMPBELLTOWN SA 5074

Typeset and Produced by:

THE ANIMAL WELFARE UNIT

DEPARTMENT FOR ENVIRONMENT AND HERITAGE

1 Richmond Road

KESWICK SA 5003

PUBLISHED 2005

Dog and Cat Management Board
The Department for Environment and Heritage

CONTENTS

Origins	3
In the Beginning	4
The Need for Action	4
Act No. 5 - 1852	6
Progress versus Experience	7
Pounds, Shillings and Pence	16
Registrars and Vanished Districts	17
Designs and Devices	20
The Twentieth Century	21
Today's World	25
Epilogue	26

Appendices

Chronology	28
List of Districts, Councils & Municipalities	29
List of Registrars – 1885	33
District 204	35
Early Place Names	36

ORIGINS

Thirty years ago our family was exploring old mining sites near Mt. Lyndhurst in the Northern Flinders Ranges when my young son found a heart shaped piece of metal and asked “What’s this dad?”. It was a dog’s “medal” - a brass registration disc dated 1906 and issued in “District 207”.

From this humble beginning we relocated from Leigh Creek in 1975 with three other discs. Then, over a time span of fifteen years, with trips to places like Morgan and Point Pass in response to my advertisements, I slowly built a collection of discs - one for each year from 1885. Finally there were five missing.

Good luck then came into play!

By chance I found that the Kapunda Museum had an old resident’s part collection with duplicates of those I needed. With some swaps and a donation, the set - now spanning 115 years, was complete.

By then my curiosity was whetted.

From where had all these registration discs been issued? The current list held 129 district numbers (now only 71) but there had been 342 proclaimed. Where were the others?

The Local Government Record Book, once it was found, only listed the dates that the numbers had been issued. The district numbers were buried in the Government Gazettes dating back to 1861.

I was in for a long search!

The Acts stipulating laws and penalties were easier to find but harder to understand. There were many “whereas, wherein, hereinafter, be it enacted” et cetera, not to mention schedules A, B & C and so on!

Thus from a chance encounter so many years ago has emerged the 150 years story of South Australia’s efforts to control man’s “best friend” - or more precisely, the owners of man’s best friend.

It is left to posterity to decide if we are winning!

Neil Ransom

July 2005

IN THE BEGINNING

It is said that Linus, a child of the God Apollo, was exposed at birth and torn in pieces by dogs. In revenge Apollo sent an avenging spirit which killed the children of the Argive Tribe.

The hero, Coroebus, destroyed her and a festival Arnis, otherwise called Kunophontis or “Dog Killing Day”, was instituted in which stray dogs were killed, sacrifice made and Linus mourned for.

Greek folklore from 3000 years ago.

Canis Familiaris

The most common theory of the dog's development is that the wolf was the main ancestor - the teeth of the wolf are identical in every way with those of the dog. Modern gene research now shows all dogs are descended from wolves tamed in China or Mongolia about 15,000 years ago.

Peoples in a paleolithic stage of culture (old stone age) had domesticated canids. In Europe, canids may have been domesticated as far back as the time of Neanderthal man, possibly more than 100,000 years ago. Cave drawings of that era include hunting scenes in which the rough form of a canine appears alongside the huntsman. One of the drawings is estimated to be 50,000 years old. A 12,000 year old canine jaw bone has been found in Israel.

In the Indus River valley in Pakistan are the remains of an ancient civilisation called the Harrapan about which little is known today. Excavations have revealed glimpses of a people whose traits are somehow familiar but whose history was lost long before the birth of Christ. More than 4000 years ago their pottery trinkets indicate they also kept birds in cages and had dogs wearing collars.

From the oldest records supplied by Babylonian and Egyptian monuments, it is clear that several distinct varieties had been developed 4000-5000 years ago. A belt buckle from the tomb of Tutankhamun (circa 14th century BC) clearly shows his hunting dog wearing a collar.

In Egypt slender dogs of the greyhound type and a short-legged breed of terrier are depicted and the Assyrians of about 600 BC had mastiff-like hounds. The Romans had both Canes Villatici (house dogs) and Canes Pastorales (sheep dogs). American Indians had dogs brought from Asia across the Bering Straits 14,000 years ago and the dingo is thought to have descended from the Indian Plains Wolf, which travelled here with the Aborigines in Australia's far distant past. Skeletons have been found dating back 3000 years.

THE NEED FOR ACTION

Let dogs delight to bark and bite For God has made them so.

Isaac Watts Divine Songs 1715.

When the first immigrants came to land at Holdfast Bay in 1836, they probably brought a dog or two with them. Sealers had already been on Kangaroo Island for several years and had natives with them and also dogs.

Dogs, as they have always been, were valued for hunting, protection, companionship and sport and figure in some of the earliest sketches of the colony.

The fledgling city was ringed by early villages like Norwood, Burnside and Magill near the hills and Port Adelaide, Glenelg and Semaphore at the coast. There were vast open spaces, no fences, roads were dirt (or mud) and all the transport depended on either horse or bullock.

The dogs were able to run loose both by day and by night. It was not possible to know to whom they belonged and in many cases they were expected to hunt and catch their own food - particularly in the country. As a result

they bred indiscriminately among themselves and soon became a public nuisance and a threat to stock and animals.

Dogs of the aborigines, or natives as they were then referred to, were an early subject of contention and conflict. A letter from the Colonial Secretary to the "Emigration Agency" in May 1837 states:

"I acknowledge your letter respecting the shooting of two native dogs belonging to the Aborigines and have the pleasure to inform you that the loss can be partially made up to them by the kindness of Sir John Jeffcott who has allowed me to offer to the natives, a puppy of a very valuable breed of Kangaroo dog which he has just brought from Van Diemens Land."

Here it seems an effort was made to keep the peace but by 1841 the situation needed more stringent methods. Following a letter of complaint to the Governor, the Colonial Secretary penned a reply on 23 December 1841.

"Sir, your letter on the subject of native's dogs was duly submitted to the Governor. His idea was that two or three of the worst dogs should be singled out by you and warning given to the natives; that if the dogs remained at large after a certain day they should be shot. This sentence should be carried into summary execution by the police to convince the natives that the Europeans were in earnest. Warning should then be given of a more extended slaughter on a future day to be fixed. The natives should then secure or take away their dogs for they are very fond of them. His Excellency conceives that by this course the least possible injury would be done to the natives and, by the police interfering, all bad feeling between individuals would be prevented".

The first form of government for South Australia was a Legislative Council presided over by the Governor and consisting of three government officials and four others appointed by the Crown.

In 1851, under an Imperial Act "to better govern Her Majesty's Colonies", a new Legislative Council was formed with twenty-four members, sixteen of whom were "returned by the electors". The Governor no longer presided and a Speaker was elected by the members. This council operated until 1857 when the present style of Government was inaugurated.

It is a measure of the importance of the dog nuisance which was by then evident, that within three weeks of the opening of the new Legislative Council, Captain Bagot asked the Colonial Secretary "if it is intended by the Government to bring in a bill this session to control the dog nuisance." His request was supported by a petition from Samuel Stocks "praying the Council to take into consideration the subject of dogs being permitted to range in the public streets without muzzles, and to provide some remedy for the same."

After fifteen years the citizens of the new colony had had enough!

The fifth bill to be presented in that first year was "An Act for abating the Nuisance and Damage to Property occasioned by the great number of Dogs which are loose in the Province of South Australia." The preamble stated:

"Whereas the streets of the City of Adelaide and other places within this Province are infested by great numbers of dogs, which are allowed to go loose at all hours of the day or night, to the danger of passengers as well as to the great annoyance of the inhabitants at large: And whereas much loss is occasioned to the owners of poultry, of sheep, and other small cattle, by the ravages of such dogs, as well as by dogs of the native breed."

The first Dog Act was granted Royal Assent on October 1852 "in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty Queen Victoria by his Excellency Sir Richard Graves McDonnell, Knight, Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Captain General and Governor in Chief of Her Majesty's Province of South Australia and Vice Admiral of the same, etc, etc, etc."

The original Act covered only "the boundaries of the city of Adelaide" but the citizens of Gawler Town promptly had Mr George Fife Angus present a petition from forty-one of their citizens "praying the Dog Nuisance Act may be extended to Gawler Town, Kapunda and Angaston."

Others were soon to follow.

ACT NUMBER 5 – 1852

*And in that town a dog was found, as many dogs there be,
Both mongrel, puppy, whelp and hound, and curs of low degree.
from "An Elegy on the Death of a Mad Dog" Oliver Goldsmith 1728-1774*

That first Act of 1852 only applied to dogs that were over four months old and had been kept in the City of Adelaide or within ten miles of it, for more than fourteen days.

There was a registration fee of one shilling and the dog was to wear a collar with the registered number engraved on it. An alphabetical list of owners was to be displayed in the Registrar's office.

All dogs were required to wear the prescribed collar and "mastiffs or bulldogs or their mongrels" were required to be muzzled "so as to prevent them from biting or injuring any person or property."

Any dog then found at large in the City and environs "without being under the immediate custody, protection or control of some competent person" or not wearing the prescribed collar or muzzle "shall be liable to be immediately killed or destroyed. All persons are authorised and all constables especially ordered and required to seize, kill and destroy every such dog."

Penalties and rewards were laid down.

Fine to fail to register	Ten to Twenty Shillings
Fine for false description of dog	Ten to Twenty Shillings
Registration Fee	One Shilling
Reward for seizing an unregistered dog	Two Shillings and six pence
Reward for destroying a native dog	Seven Shillings and six pence

Where a dog had been destroyed within the city boundaries "proof shall be given that such dog was immediately removed from the streets, or buried, or otherwise disposed of so as to prevent nuisance to any of the inhabitants" and the dog's scalp must be produced to claim a reward.

A further penalty was imposed on any owner whose dog "shall in any street, thoroughfare or public place in the City or the Province, rush at or attack any person, horse, bullock, or other cattle, whereby the life or limbs of any person shall be endangered, or property injured. Such dog shall be liable to be immediately destroyed and the owner shall pay a penalty of not less than Twenty Shillings or more than Five Pounds over and above the amount of any damage." Dogs were deemed to belong to the owner of the premises where they were kept and exemptions were made for some dogs provided they were muzzled and chained to drays and wagons passing through the city or actually droving sheep or cattle.

Police were not only "ordered and required" to destroy dogs when called upon, but could be fined from ten to twenty shillings for neglect of this duty.

Apparently tough times called for tough measures!

Within eight years there was a need to further amend the law.

A new Act in 1860 covered the whole of the Province and power was given to divide the State (or Province as it was then called) into districts with distinguishing numbers and registrars. Crown Land Rangers were introduced and registrars outside towns and council areas could claim travel expenses for the long distances they had to cover on horse back or buggy.

The registration fee was dramatically increased from one shilling to ten shillings but this was obviously resisted as unjust because in the following year it was reduced to five shillings (see following chapter).

Other penalties however remained high - failure to register had increased from ten shillings to three pounds and policemen could be fined up to five pounds for neglect of duty.

Enforcing the Act was not popular either with the public or the police. This letter in the State Archives from a police inspector dated March 1855 highlights the issues.

“Asked if I had taken steps to enforce the act - I held back as long as possible being unwilling to destroy animals and gave repeated public warnings. At last finding that forbearance was abused, I issued orders for the destruction of all dogs illegally at large. In the last six days 58 dogs have been killed and during the last ten days about 220 have been registered!”

A further Act in 1867 included in detail the method by which costs could be recovered through the Courts for damage inflicted by dogs.

But by 1884 it was necessary to further tighten the laws.

PROGRESS VERSUS EXPERIENCE

The dog to gain some private ends, went mad and bit the man- The man recovered of the bite, the dog it was that died.

An Elegy on the Death of a Mad Dog

Oliver Goldsmith 1728-1774

In 1884, after meetings had been held throughout the country asking Parliament to take action in the matter, the Commissioner of Crown Lands found it necessary to introduce a new bill to Parliament. He said its purpose was “for abating what was acknowledged to be a very serious nuisance caused by the immense number of dogs kept in country towns especially. His experience was that a lot of useless, half-starved animals roved about in packs in the neighbourhood of towns and did serious injury to the flocks in the paddocks adjacent.”

A select committee of five members of parliament was subsequently appointed to hear evidence on the progress over the last thirty years.

The subject of dog control was a controversial one of course and the evidence they heard showed past experience to be less than satisfactory.

The record of the proceedings include these words from the Chairman:

“A large number of people think that it would press hardly upon a certain section of the community to have an increased tax upon dogs, and another large section of the community think that it would be very desirable that anything that can be done to reduce the number of dogs should be done.”

The committee itself came in for criticism. Some considered it “an attempt at class legislation in favour of the squatting members of the community” and it was even suggested the MPs were a “squatting committee”. When it was quickly pointed out that two were farmers and one a journalist, the witness amended his statement: “Not exactly squatters perhaps....but gentlemen who look after the squatters’ interests.”

The poor claimed that with their large families they could not pay any higher fee on their dogs and that “because they cannot afford it as the more wealthy might do, it would be an interference with their rights as citizens of a free state to deprive them of keeping a dog.”

Evidence was taken on a wide range of subjects including:

- Existing problems
- Aboriginal dogs
- Stock losses and compensation
- Identification of registered dogs
- Policing of the Act
- Rights to search and destroy
- Control of female dogs
- Level of fees
- Use of poison

And from a wide cross section of the community including:

- Police officers, both city and country

Landowners at Beaumont and Dry Creek
Squatters from Mt Crawford and Delamere
Dog breeders
City registrars of dogs
The secretary of a Coursing Club
A journalist

The evidence presented showed many continuing difficulties. Despite the existing laws, dogs at large were still a serious problem.

Stock Losses

Sir Samuel Davenport of Beaumont when asked "Have you suffered much damage from dogs?", replied "Yes, very considerable damage. I have sometimes had three or four sheep killed night after night, and I have had sometimes as many of a score of sheep killed at one time."

John Warren, who had been a pioneer at Mt Crawford for thirty-five years, had been seriously thinking of giving up keeping sheep altogether until the registration fee of five shillings had been imposed. "I have known thirty of forty, even fifty sheep killed by dogs in a night. A neighbour of mine who had only fifteen hundred sheep, lost eighty of them by the ravages of dogs overnight."

City folk with sporting dogs such as kangaroo dogs, greyhounds and water spaniels were another problem. Mr. Pitts, a landowner at the Levels, Dry Creek, stated:

"Persons come on your land without leave for the purpose of sporting and set you at defiance. These men go to the public houses and then, having got half mad with drink, it is very unpleasant work tackling them to induce them to leave your property. I have no objection to people having what sport they like but I do object to these men coming up to my place and roaming about over it without leave. I have to pay my men £1 a head for every dog they kill, and that alone amounts to a pretty considerable tax in a year."

Another man had written to the Committee:

"Members of the larrikin class in Adelaide go out coursing on Sundays. Three or four of them will get a trap, take two or three dogs with them, and go to some quiet road, scouring the fields around in search of hares. Their dogs are the half-fed, half-bred hounds which do so much mischief among the sheep. If you order these larrikins off your land they blackguard you or say they did not know they were doing any harm although their dogs may just have been driving your sheep in all directions. To prosecute them is a waste of time as they are worth nothing and you cannot possibly recover damages."

Mr. Shakespeare, the registrar of dogs for the City of Adelaide added "I have a relative who goes out hunting hares and rabbits and some times loses his dogs for two or three days at a time."

The problem was also rife in the outlying districts. The manager of Nilpena Station reported 637 sheep lost in twelve months, partly by native dogs and partly by tame dogs gone wild and many by dogs belonging to teamsters on the Blinman road and railway workmen (constructing the Great Northern Railway).

The manager of Wilpena Station claimed "the blacks in my opinion are allowed to keep too many dogs which probably intermix with the dingo."

Mr. Tolmer the overseer of Arkaba Station in 1884, paid his men £1 each for 94 dog scalps and also shot 25 himself - a total of 119 in twelve months. However his return from the government under the Vermin Act was only £38, barely a third of his expenses.

Enforcing the Act

Inspector Sullivan of Adelaide reported "During the last four months 516 unregistered dogs have been seized by the police in the city alone. From the wholesale slaughter of dogs by the police in the city and suburbs during the

last four months, the numbers of useless dogs roaming about have been considerably reduced and the destruction is still carried on with vigour.”

However this zeal was not often the case. Sir Samuel Davenport stated bluntly “It would appear there are 109 district registrars and 140 corporations and district councils making a total of 249 local agencies besides the police. All this machinery is supposed to be employed in carrying out the Dog Act, and yet next to nothing is really done to abate the nuisance!”

Mr. Pitts, when asked had any attempt been made to carry out the Dog Act, said that after complaining “the Commissioner sent some police out on several Sundays but as they were mounted on white horses and wore easily recognisable uniforms the people kept out of the way. The troopers came out from town - they were not local police and there was very little they could do.”

Some police officers carried out house to house inspections but most citizens agreed that the Act was not strictly carried out. There was also some doubt as to the legality of entering a mans yard to search for dogs. In the city, an inspector was granted a warrant to enter back yards, but the Police Commissioner considered that for police officers do so would bring them “too much in collision with the public.”

Generally police did not like doing this work. Mr Shakespeare claimed “they are only induced to do it by peremptory orders.”

Mr. Lovekin - a journalist in Adelaide, took a keen interest in the Act and on this subject said “The Police Commissioner said the police will not kill dogs and I don’t think the police ought to be compelled to do it, because a man, when he enters Her Majesty’s service as a guardian of the peace, does not undertake to become a murderer and burier of dogs.”

Mr. Peterswald, the Police Commissioner added “If a policeman makes himself unpopular in a township he ceases virtually to be of any use and if he were to go about killing every dog he found he would get into hot water with all the leading people in the township.”

Not everyone agreed however. Mr. William Haines, the registrar at Tea Tree Gully, said

“The people do not take it at all amiss that the police should make the necessary inquiries to secure enforcement of the Act; but that a private person should turn informer is extremely odious to them. One of my neighbours turned informer and a good deal of feeling was created in the district. One man said “If snakes and he were turned into a sawpit, the snakes would have to clear out.” That shows the feeling of the people, who consider the police are paid by the country to do their duty. When they do their duty they cause no ill feeling whatever; but if private people do what properly belongs to the police there is considerable irritation.”

Mr. Warren of Mt Crawford stated he had never heard of the police enforcing the Act in his district and when he had asked the Commissioner to compel his men to carry out their duties he was informed that “if the police were compelled to carry out the Act, the best men in the force would probably resign their positions.”

And the police had other problems as well. Mr. Tripp complained:

“I would like to point out to the Committee that some provision ought to be made with regard to the place where dogs killed by the police shall be buried. At present I believe they are buried in the back yard of the police station. I cannot say positively whether it is done in Adelaide, but I know it is done in the suburbs.

They shoot them in the back yard of the police station at Norwood (where he lived) and I believe the dogs are buried there. If that yard was going to be turned into a garden, the place would be found to be pretty well manured!”

Aboriginals’ Dogs

The dogs kept by aborigines was always a matter of contention - both as to numbers and condition.

The Honourable Thomas Elder was reported in Hansard 1857 as saying,

“Regarding dogs of aborigines, I would be sorry to stand in the shoes of a Protector of Aborigines who attempted to shoot the dogs of the natives because unregistered. The natives regard their dogs with peculiar feelings and in many instances would rather have their lubras killed than their dogs, the destruction of which would cause feelings of revenge that nothing would satisfy.”

Mr. Lovekin, in his evidence of 1884 reported

“When near Port Willunga some time ago I saw some aboriginal with as many as fifteen, sixteen, seventeen or eighteen dogs with him. These dogs were of the most inferior kind - the very worst of mongrels. They were the class of dogs that would wander about and kill sheep and do all the damage we hear so much about. The black fellows are far too lazy to kill possums to feed their dogs on, and even if they were not, I’m sure that their class of dog would decidedly prefer a haunch of fresh mutton to a dainty feed of gum-tasty possum.”

Mr. Henry Strong Price from Delamere concurred. “It would be no hardship to limit the number of dogs they might keep - they are nothing but a lot of mangy curs that cannot possibly catch a kangaroo.”

It was pointed out that the blacks were not stationary, they move about from place to place and when leaving a camp often leave their dogs behind them. In evidence it was stated that some white people have even said their dogs come from the camps belonging to the blacks so as to avoid registration.

Mr. Lovekin summarised by saying “Aboriginals, having to get a living by hunting, might be allowed to keep two dogs, but they now go about in families or gangs and take a number of dogs with them. In my opinion three dogs at the outside would be quite enough.”

The proposed legislation was therefore framed thus:-

“The aboriginal inhabitants of the province shall be allowed to keep two dogs for hunting purposes without payment of registration fee. Provided no family shall be allowed to keep more than three such dogs and provided any dogs found at large shall be dealt with in a similar manner as other dogs under the Act.”

Female Dogs

In 1884 the common term for a female dog was “a slut” and in some cases “a bitch”. When a female dog was inclined to mate it was referred to as “on heat”. In this condition it was common for a female dog to be followed by a pack of as many as fifteen or sixteen male dogs.

The City of Adelaide registrar quoted a case that occurred in Hindley Street. “Recently a lady had with her a slut which was followed by not less than ten dogs. The poor lady was compelled to rush into a drapers shop and get someone to seize the slut.”

Messers Aldridge and Tripp; dog breeders at Norwood, considered the police should be entitled to seize a bitch on heat and confine her if she were registered rather than shoot her as proposed, and that the owner should be fined.

Questions were asked of all the witnesses regarding increased fees for keeping female dogs. Mr. John Low Thompson, manager of an estate at Beefacres, six miles from Adelaide, was questioned at length on the matter.

“You are aware of dogs following bitches on heat. Do you think they are likely to do a specially large amount of damage at such time?” “Yes.”

“Do you think it would tend to reduce the number of dogs in the country if a heavier tax were put on sluts? And do you think persons would care to keep mongrel sluts if they had to pay a double fee?”

“My opinion is that they would not. A good many people like to keep a dog, but I don’t think they care much what sort of dog it is, and they would keep male dogs in preference if they had to pay more on sluts.”

“Do you think, if a double fee was charged on sluts that, when a bitch pupped, the owner would be most likely to destroy all the female pups to avoid paying double fees on them?”

“Yes”

“He would most likely, when he wanted to make a present to his friends, therefore give them the male pups?”

“Yes, most likely.”

“You think therefore that a double fee on sluts would tend to decrease the nuisance arising from dogs?”

“That is certainly my opinion.”

Again, not all agreed. Mr. W. Haines pointed out “It must be remembered that raising fees would press hardly on poor people. A poor man has as much right to keep a slut as a rich one. The sluts are better than male dogs for catching possums. I know poor families who have earned fifteen pounds in a season by catching possums. If you were to put a heavy registration fee on the dog of a family like that, the effect might be to drive the family into the destitute asylum.”

The Act when amended that year increased the registration fee for female dogs from five shillings to twelve and six pence!

Compensation for Losses

Mr. Peterswald, the Police Commissioner, when asked his opinion regarding those cases where persons are unable to pay for damage done by their dogs confessed “I do not know what is to be done. A poor man may have a dog which may go and damage valuable cattle belonging to a breeder and it is practically impossible to recover the amount of damage done.”

Sir Samuel Davenport highlighted the problem when he described an incident which happened to his stock near Port Adelaide.

“I had seven sheep once in a small paddock there, which were all killed one night, and the man in charge going out in the dark with his gun, fired at two dogs which he saw and killed one. He found a collar on the dog, and he sent it on to me. I found that it was the collar of a large dog, and there was a brass plate on it, but the name had been erased. It had evidently been taken off by friction. However, the number of the district and the number of the registration was on it, and so I communicated with the registrar of the district and asked if he would be good enough to inform me what description of dog was entered on the register against the number in his books to which the registration applied.

His reply was to the effect that Mr. So-and-So had two dogs registered with that number, and their description was that of two small kangaroo dogs. I saw at once that could not possibly refer to this dog that my man had shot. I went down and saw the man who had shot the dog and found that it was a large black and white Newfoundland dog. I put the matter into the hands of the police and discovered who was the owner. It transpired that the dog had been registered in the previous year but was not registered when shot. The man was in business in the neighbourhood and I communicated with him and asked him if he would make some reparation. He never did and I found that I could not proceed against him because my man did not actually see the dog attack the sheep.”

Mr. Thompson, manager for Hart Bros at Beefacres, stated, “I believe you cannot shoot registered dogs unless you see them in the act of destroying your property, and I do not know if you can recover money from a man if he refuses to pay. However, I shot two dogs a little while ago while I was riding on horseback. They were dogs belonging to a person at Walkerville. I went up to his place and claimed compensation for the losses done to the sheep and he paid at once fifteen pounds for each dog.”

On another occasion he applied a novel solution to the problem of owners who were unable to pay compensation. When asked by Mr. Miller, “I suppose sometimes you find the owners of dogs which kill the sheep unable to pay for damage?” He replied,

“That was the case with the owner of the dogs which we traced to Stepney. We told the owner of the dogs that they had done a great deal of damage and that we wanted him to make good the amount. He said he had been out of work for three months and that he had a wife and a large number of children to support, so that it was impossible to get the money. I wrote to the man requesting him to come out and try to make some arrangements with Mr. Hart about the damage done to the sheep by his dogs. Mr. Hart, finding that nothing could be done with the

man, for it was impossible that he could pay for anything, said that if the man shot the dogs and undertook to bury them he would take no further proceedings. I made him dig a hole in a hard place six feet deep and bury the dogs. That was all we could do, for of course you can't get 'breeks off a highlandman'!"

Poison

The police inspector at Port Augusta complained "There is scarcely a day passes but what I get malignant letters from people complaining of the use of poison." Mr. Hawker, M.P., asked, "Do you not think it serves people right if they get their dogs poisoned? The dogs have no right running about on other people's land and the owners of dogs who do this must take the consequence."

The inspector replied, "It is illegal to spread poison. In my opinion, if dogs are properly fed and looked after they will not roam about to the extent they do now."

Mr. Warren at Mt Crawford was more practical.

"It is at present illegal to lay poison, but if it had not been for the free use of strychnine we should never have got rid of wild dogs. In the very early days we had to use the nux vomica bean which we boiled but that was not very effective. I don't see why a person should not be allowed to protect himself by placing poison in his paddocks in the same way Government parties use sulphide of carbon to destroy rabbits. There can be no possible objection to a man placing poison on his paddocks to destroy dogs which have no business there."

Mr. Pitts agreed "In my opinion it is just as justifiable to poison these dogs which kill the sheep as it is to poison an eagle or a wild hawk."

But there were risks.

Mr. Butt pointed out. "I fancy that if a man were to lay poison on his land and a crow carried it away onto the road where the bait was picked up by a dog, the owner of the dog would have a substantial claim for damages."

Even so the law was broken.

Mr. Lovekin: "What they do now is to lay a trail of carraway seed down leading to a poisoned bait. They put the seed down in a straight line to the road and the dogs passing get on the scent and follow it up into the paddock and take the bait. I have seen this done myself and the end of the trail is generally made to come out at cross roads where dogs congregate if there are any about."

The law was subsequently changed and the Amendment Act 1884 in clause 14 read:

"The occupier of any land, after giving public notice in three successive issues of any two papers circulating in the district where such land is situate, or of the Government Gazette, of his intention to destroy dogs trespassing on such land, may destroy the same, and, if the land is beyond limits of town or suburban lands, may lay poison on the land for the purpose of such destruction; but so that notice of such poison being laid be conspicuously exhibited on such land, and that no poison be laid within two hundred yards of any public road or way."

Searching Private Property

The previous Act of 1867 had no provision for police to enter private property to enforce registration on dog owners. When asked "Can police enter a man's private property to see whether he has dogs there which are registered or unregistered?", the Police Commissioner answered "No". He agreed that farms could be searched but was inclined to think that searching in a man's back yard might be objectionable. "If the police were allowed to go into premises attached to private dwelling houses to hunt about for dogs, they would be accused of doing all sorts of things whenever they were found dodging about a man's back yard" he said.

When further invited to comment on an article in the press suggesting sending a person to each house with the authority to destroy any unregistered dog or issue a licence on the spot, he was asked "Do you think the

suggestion a good one?”. He answered tersely “Certainly not; people, at any rate English people, do not like these domiciliary visits; they are not used to them and will not submit to any arrangements of that kind.”

Mr. Aldridge did not agree. “I certainly think that if the police have not power to search a yard they ought to get it. There is no chance of tracing out unregistered dogs unless a man can follow them up on the premises to which they are tracked.”

But the Act of 1884 stopped short of giving police or registrars the power to search private property. It was the duty of the registrar “to cause inquiries to be made on all occupied premises in the district to ascertain if any unregistered dogs are kept thereon” but a search warrant had to be granted by a Justice of the Peace.

Identification of Registered Dogs

The original law of 1852 only applied to the City of Adelaide and simply required that a registered dog “shall have a collar round its neck with the number corresponding to the register of the same legally inscribed thereon.”

By 1867 the law had been extended to cover the whole Province and the collar also needed the number of the district in which the dog was registered and the name of the owner engraved on it. A penalty of between five shillings and forty shillings was prescribed if such a collar was not provided.

Such a collar presented problems to constables and landowners trying to see if a loose dog was in fact registered.

Mr. Warren: “The Act is not carried out at all and there is no means of knowing whether a dog, even though he may wear a collar, is registered or not.”

Mr. Pitts: “The collar is not much use by itself because the hair hides it and you are afraid to shoot at a dog which appears to have no collar and be unregistered, because after all it may turn out to have a collar on.”

Mr. Batt, when asked what is done at present about engraving on collars,
“In many cases it is not done at all. There is extreme difficulty in getting the name put on. The name costs about one and sixpence in the city to engrave. Many people give away their collars if they don’t want them and other people use them.” (The collar was not required to have the period of registration marked on it.)

The Select Committee had heard of a scheme in use in San Francisco whereby a dog was required to wear “a brass pendant” to show its current registration.

Mr. Pitts: “The pendant would be a very useful thing because it could be recognised at a distance.”

Mr. Aldridge, (when it was suggested the disc would be about the size of a shilling) “I don’t think it could be seen at all at any distance and I don’t see what good it would be.”

Mr. Shakespeare thought it was “a capital idea” and suggested the disc should be as simple as possible with one or two holes punched in it and should be perfectly plain.

Mr. Butt, Clerk of the Council at Mitcham and registrar of dogs, further suggested,
“By my plan the plate would vary in shape each year so that it would be very easy to detect whether any dog had been registered for the current year or not. One side should be embossed and the other stamped with the name of the district and the number of the registration. I would ignore the owner’s name on the disc altogether.”

He had also made inquiries with regard to the price of the “plates” and “I find they can be manufactured for about four pence each.”

Being a very thorough Clerk he went on to do some sums.

“The registrars would charge sixpence for them, and thus twopence profit would be made on each plate; that profit would pay the cost of the surplus plates, which might never be used, but which would have to be manufactured; but I think that a charge of even a shilling might be

made for the plates. I do not think the public would object to it, because they would have the necessary inscription on the plate for one shilling, whereas now they have to pay one and sixpence for the engraving. I have made the following calculation in regard to this matter:- Last year there were 25,000 dogs registered approximately, and I fancy that the next year this number will be increased to 30,000. Now if, when the Act comes in force, we charge a shilling, that would be 30,000 plates at a shilling, giving a profit of 30,000 times eight pence or £1,000. The surplus £1,000 could be used for the purpose of remunerating special inspectors to hunt up unregistered dogs.”

This suggestion was adopted into the new Act and the suitable design shown in the Government Gazette of June 25 1885.

This was the first “Dog’s Medal”.

The Cost of Keeping a Dog

In 1852 the original fee was only applied to the City of Adelaide and was set out at one shilling. By 1860, when the dog problem throughout the Colony remained unabated, the fee was increased to ten shillings but in the following year was reduced to five shillings.

Five shillings remained the prescribed fee for twenty-three years until in 1884 when the whole subject of control of dogs was reviewed.

Various fees were suggested depending on the type of dog and the sex of the dog. Some considered the fees and fines were sufficient if the magistrates would only impose them. The Police Commissioner, Mt. Peterswald, said “The fees are sufficient if the magistrates would impose them, but the fact is that the country magistrates particularly look on the matter with lenient eye”. Inspector Saunders of Clare complained “J.P.s have not attempted to remedy the evil by inflicting a high fine but have always inflicted the lowest. This was the case here last week when the police had nine cases in court.”

Concern was expressed about increased fees for sporting dogs, station people and their dogs and the ability of the working class to pay fees.

Mr. Butt, “I do not think it would be desirable to raise the fee generally because I know that in the hills district there are number of market gardeners who are completely swarmed out by hares and must keep a dog to keep the hares down.”

Mr. Henry Strong Price, when asked “Do you, on any stations of yours, experience any trouble from rabbits?” answered, “Yes, at Booberowie we have. We have kept over one hundred dogs there for the purpose of destroying rabbits.”

Mr. Lovekin “I would exempt the shepherd’s dog from payment of registration. These men get very small salaries and I look on their dogs as I would a mechanic’s tools. All the English Acts of modern days very carefully set out that the tools by which a subject earns his bread are to be kept intact and without molestation by the law.”

Mr. Lovekin again “I live at Prospect and a large number of the poorer classes - people whose incomes do not exceed £70 a year - have spoken to me on the subject and claim they cannot afford to pay any higher fee.”

In July 1884 a petition was received from seventy-three settlers at Point Pass “praying that the fees for dogs be not increased.”

The registration fee for dogs was subsequently increased from five shillings to seven and sixpence (with twelve and six for sluts) but two years later, in 1888, District Councils were given the power to reduce fees to as low as two and sixpence but only on proof to the Commissioner of Crown Lands “that the district is infested with vermin” - rabbits no doubt!

Over the next few years many Councils did so as farmers faced increasing hardship.

Rewards and Penalties

Under the Act of 1867 there were both penalties for non compliance and rewards for the destruction of “loose” dogs. The City Registrar defined loose dogs as “dogs found wandering about and not under the immediate control of anybody. They should not be allowed to wander around - there should be somebody about who is responsible for the dog.”

The reward for seizing or destroying an unregistered dog was two and sixpence but to claim it, the dog’s scalp had to be produced to a Justice of the Peace as proof. If the dog had been killed within township boundaries, proof was also required that “such dog was immediately removed from the streets or buried so as to prevent nuisance or annoyance to residents.”

Mr. Batt, the registrar at Magill, argued for an increase in the reward. He said “Having seized a dog, a person must notify a J.P. who must summon the owner and then, if not claimed within twenty-four hours, the same shall be forthwith killed. Then having done all this the dog has to be scalped and buried. Then the person has to produce the scalp to the registrar and claim the reward. The reward is two and six which is not sufficient.”

Mr. Lovekin “Persons should be able to make quite a good living at destroying these dogs. At the present time people do not care to go in for the business because the process of obtaining the reward is too cumbrous.”

However it would seem a reward did not apply to police officers.

Mr. Lovekin: “When I made enquiries from the police when I was engaged on “The Register”, I was told that persons in the employment of the Government could not participate in the reward. I was told, as a matter of fact, that the police had all the trouble of destroying the dogs and getting the scalps ready, and get nothing for it.”

The reward was subsequently doubled to five shillings in the new Act of 1884.

The dogs destroyed and paid for by the City Council of Adelaide in 1883 were 400 and for the first eight months of 1884 were 537!

Penalties under the old Act applied both to owners and police.

They were for owners:-

Keeping an unregistered dog	£1 to £5
Misdescription of dog	£2 to £5
Owning a dog at large	5/- to £2
Owning a dog attacking a person or animal	£2 to £5
Illegally removing a collar	£2 to £5

For police there were prescribed penalties for:-

Neglecting to destroy dogs at large	£2 to £5
Wilfully destroying a dog contrary to the Act	£1 to £5

Most of the witnesses agreed with this level of penalties but Mr. Shakespeare complained “the Police magistrates generally inflict the lowest fine they possibly can.”

This was addressed in the new Act! When it came out fines were increased, in some cases substantially.

- Unregistered dog £6.
- Owning a dog at large £5
- Owner of a dog causing damage £30
- And for the removal of a collar or disc - six months imprisonment!

Our Dog Jim

*We own a dog, his name is Jim
And nobody gets the best of him.
One day when walking down the town,
The dogs was kicked by Jenkins Brown .
Jim made no fuss, but he was riled,
Although he merely looked and smiled.
Now when the policeman came around
Our Jim was nowhere to be found.
“Had we a dog, and paid the cost?”
We said our dog was lately lost.*

*And so the policeman went away,
And called on Jenkins Brown next day.
“Had he a dog?” He’d swore he’d not
When Jim appeared upon the spot
And jumped around and licked his hand
To let the policeman understand.
When Jim saw Brown had paid the fine
He came back home with us to dine.
And that’s how we saved our half a crown
And Jim got level with Jenkins Brown!*

*W.T. Goodge 1862 - 1909
Arrived Australia 1880*

POUNDS, SHILLINGS AND PENCE

The Imperial monetary system of pounds, shillings and pence was introduced into the Colony when the British settlers arrived in 1836 and remained in use until the decimal system took its place.

In 1968, one pound (£1) became two dollars (\$2), ten shillings (10/-) equalled one dollar (\$1), a shilling (or 12 pence) became ten cents (10c) and sixpence (6d) became 5 cents (5c).

In this book pounds shillings and pence will show as follows:

£1/2.- or one pound, two shillings
10/- or ten shillings
2/4- or two shillings and four pence
6d or six pence

However, to convert the Imperial value of charges and penalties in those days into their strict equivalent in dollars and cents is meaningless unless the costs of living and pay rates in those days are compared with the present.

In 1839, labourers engaged on the survey of South Australia were earning between 3/- and 4/- a day. By 1841 this had risen to 4/- and 6/-. Four shillings a day equates to £1/4/- a week or \$2.40 as the metric equivalent. A week in those days was six days of eight hours. At the time of the first Act in 1852 the Government Gazette printed “the Average Wages of Mechanics and others in South Australia”.

Carpenters & Blacksmiths 10/- a day (£3 a week)
Masons & Bricklayers 12/- a day (£3/12/- a week)
Day labourers 6/- per day (£1/16/- per week)

Married couples as servants on a farm were paid up to £60 per year with board and lodgings provided and shepherds slightly less at £50 per annum. This equates to £1/3/0 for a six day week for couples and less than £1/0/0 a week for a shepherd.

The cost of registering a dog in that year of 1852 was fixed at one shilling for the City of Adelaide but eight years later, when the Act was expanded to cover the whole Province, the fee was raised to ten shillings but no doubt due to a huge public outcry, was reduced the following year to five shillings where it remained until 1884.

The minimum wage rate in 2002 was \$12.85 per hour or \$475 per week for a thirty-seven hour week. In the 1800s a week consisted of forty-eight hours so that a labourer working the same hours today would earn \$616 per week. At \$2 for the old £1, \$616 converts to about £300 or almost 300 times a shepherd's earnings in about 1860.

Therefore a registration fee of five shillings would equate to twelve hours pay for a shepherd and at today's minimum rate would be more than \$150. The current registration rate is less than \$45.

It is no wonder the fee of ten shillings was short lived!

There is another way of looking at it.

In the 1852 Gazette a question was asked of the Immigration Authority at Port Adelaide. "What is the rent of a town lodging suitable for a mechanic and his family?" The answer was "from five shillings to six shillings a week."

If a dog owner today was asked to pay a registration fee the equivalent of a week's rent of a house in the city, there would be very few dogs kept legally and that was no doubt the case then.

In fact on 21 July 1854 the Audit Office wrote: "The Auditor General begs to draw to the attention of the Colonial Secretary, Act No.5 1852. Some stringent measures on the part of the police seem necessary to secure our annual registration of dogs."

Fees paid in Adelaide Dec 1852 & Jan/Feb 53: £193/5/0

Fees paid in Adelaide Dec 1853 & Jan/Feb 54: £16/0/0

And again in March 1855 the Audit Office wrote: "The following statement shows the annual tax on dogs is now scarcely a source of revenue though the number of dogs at large in Adelaide does not seem to have diminished."

Dog fees collected 1852 £154/19/0

Dog fees collected 1853 £80/0/0

Dog fees collected 1854 £36/19/0

Dog fees collected Jan/Feb 55 £3/17/0

Passing a law was one thing, carrying it out quite another!

The penalty on a police constable for neglect of duty was equally severe. In the Act of 1867 it was prescribed as from £2 to £5. The pay rate for a foot constable was about £70 a year or 5/- a day so that £2 would equal eight days pay or close to \$1000 today. There is no record of a fine like this ever being imposed and it was dropped in 1884.

REGISTRARS & VANISHED DISTRICTS

On the collar of a dog he gave to the King:

***"I am his Highness Dog at Kew.
Pray tell me Sir, whose dog are you?"***

Alexander Pope, 1688-1744.

The formation of the Colony required that land be surveyed before it could be occupied and the State was progressively laid out in Counties and Hundreds within which were townships and villages. As settlement expanded, Corporations were formed for the city & larger country towns and District Councils for farming lands. Beyond that was simply defined by Hundred boundaries or “the limits of occupation”.

Bureaucracy took over and every part of the State and Northern Territory was partitioned into “Dog Districts” regardless of the practicality of administering the Act.

In 1861 there were seventy-four districts established and the registrars were proclaimed in the Government Gazette. Their offices were scattered far and wide.

In the far north, J. Wauhope was a Corporal of Police at Angipena with the responsibility to register dogs over a district that stretched from “North of the Latitude of Patawarta to the East of a line extending northwards from the head of the Gulf to the limits of occupation”.

In that year he registered 110 dogs!

The registrar for Kangaroo Island, Mr. Martin, had his office at his residence at Hog Bay but his duties could not have been onerous. For three years he didn’t record a single registration!

The registrar at Wellington was also the Sub-Protector of Aborigines.

Some of the registrars were more fortunate - Mr. Green, the registrar for Talunga had his office at the Traveller’s Inn, Blumberg (now Birdwood) and, Mr. Strawbridge, registrar of Payneham, held court at Glynde Inn. As he registered 243 dogs that year he must have spent a lot of time at the hotel!

Other locations were harder to find - Mr. Saml. Smith’s office was his residence at King’s Belt and the registrar for East Torrens could be found at the School-house - Grassy Flat.

The registrars were required to submit returns of course and the Auditor took a keen interest in the resultant input to the State’s finances. Parliament in 1863 scrutinised the last three years figures. The revenue in 1861 was £6058 but it had dropped markedly to about £3500 for the next two years. No doubt another reminder letter was sent!

The number of dogs registered in 1861 was 16,813 and the State population was 126,830 giving a ratio of one dog for 7.5 persons. Today the population figures are 1,500,000 and registered dogs 283,564 giving the present ratio of one dog for 5.3 persons. Perhaps we are more law abiding these days!

In those days registration figures reflected the large portion of the population living in the north of the State. Mines were operating at Burra Burra (Redruth), Moonta and Blinman and the figures reflect that.

District	Dogs (6 months only 1868)
Adelaide City	257
Angaston	270
Clare	212
Moonta	327
Redruth	603
Mt Remarkable	795
Port Augusta	521
Blinman	404

Registrars “were to receive the sum of one shilling for each dog kept within the district for which he is registrar, and duly registered by him”. They were also allowed “the sum of sixpence per mile for travelling expenses in the event of their being required to attend as witnesses before any Court of Justice”.

The City of Adelaide was the first district to be proclaimed in 1851. Others were added progressively after the Act of 1861 extending the law to cover the whole Province. The original numbers were then changed with Adelaide becoming number 51 and the list dividing into Corporations and District Councils.

As other Corporations were formed they were added backwards from number 51.

In 1875 the numbers 200 to 270 were set aside as district numbers for those parts of the Province “not being within the limits of any corporate city, town, or district.”

But within a few years it was necessary to alter it all again. Four years later (1879) it was “expedient to revoke the aforesaid proclamation and issue another in lieu thereof”. The need for district numbers had already grown beyond 270.

By 1886 the number of proclaimed outlying districts stretched from 200 to 342 not including the Northern Territory. Some were hard to define - particularly district no. 204. Appendix 5 shows the difficulty of an area near Kadina and Wallaroo (refer to page 56).

In 1884 five districts were proclaimed for the Northern Territory which had been part of the Colony of South Australia since 1863. There were registrars appointed at Palmerston, Southport, Yam Creek, Daly Waters and Barrow’s Creek. In each case they were “the officer in charge of the police station.” But within eight years, although there was still a registrar at Palmerston (early name for Darwin), the other offices were then located at Burrundie, Katherine, Alice Springs and Borooloola.

In 1900 there was a total of twelve districts proclaimed in the Northern Territory, most so vast that boundaries were fixed by parallels of latitude and meridians of longitude. With the transfer of government to the Commonwealth in 1911, these districts were removed from South Australia’s jurisdiction.

In the Government Gazette of June 1886, the names of the registrars in Districts 200 to 342 were published together with their locality.

Test your knowledge of early South Australia on some of the place names taken from that list.

Wirreanda	Lochaber	Julia
Bramfield*	Baldina	Dalkey
Condowie Plains	Custon	Sharp’s Wells
Mongolata	Bundey*	Amyton
Winninnie	Paratoo*	Government Gums
Keilli*	Willow Plains*	Richman’s Creek*
Yarrowie	Mannanarie*	Yalpara*
Wonoka*	Levens*	Everard Central*
Yatina*	King*	Franklyn
Kalkabury*	Cavenagh*	Willowie East
Mount Rat*	Petersburg*	Wrenfordsley
Lancelot	Flaxman’s Valley	Collinfield
Morchard*	Mudla Wirra North	Walloway*
Minlacowie*	Onaunga	Uroonda
Booyoolie	Portland Estate	Caunamount
Neales	Stanley	Peela Weela*
English	Alma Plains	Willamulka*
Grace	Apoinga	Nugent*

All those marked with an asterisk had Post Offices.

Many of the district numbers changed over the years and no continuous record had been kept but all the changes had been faithfully proclaimed in Government Gazettes.

Diligent searching of these records from the last 150 years has enabled the consolidated list of district numbers that appears in Appendices 3 and 4.

Lists of districts with their allocated numbers were produced in 1861, 1868, 1875, 1879 and 1882 but the list produced in Appendix 3 follows from 1885 when the first metal medals began to appear.

Many of the district boundaries outside corporate towns and council areas were complex and altered as settlement expanded. Therefore in Appendix 4 only the location of the registrar’s office is given for districts 200 onwards.

The current list of districts only totals seventy-one.

DESIGN & DEVICES

*The poor dog, in life the firmest friend,
The first to welcome, the foremost to defend.*

Lord Byron 1809

In June of 1885 the Government Gazette carried the details of the discs to be issued from July 1st that year.

Tenders were called for the manufacture of “discs composed of solid brass and to be of the size, quality, thickness and finish of the sample to be seen in the office of the Commissioner of Crown Lands.” Each disc was to bear on one side the device described as “The Royal Arms” and on the other the inscriptions of “District No.” and “Regd. No.”

The original disc was fitted with a metal ring but subsequently this was changed to “suitable copper rivets and burrs and approved hide loops.”

The discs for sluts were to be distinguished from dogs by having a second hole under the words “District Number”.

Over the ensuing years, although the idea of a different shape each year was unchanged, there were many variations.

Brass was used until World War II when all available brass was required for shells and bullet cases. Then from 1940 until 1966 the so-called “discs” were from pressed steel except that from 1947 to 1951, for some unknown reason, they reverted back to brass.

The 1960s was the beginning of the age of plastic and economy. Different shapes were discarded for the universal circular disc and years were then differentiated by colour which remains the pattern today. Materials varied from plastic (1966-1970), aluminium (1971-1987) and then back to the plastic in present use.

The shapes were many and varied. Common were variation on triangles, circles, hearts, ovals, squares, hexagons (Refer to Appendix 7).

The original “device” described as “The Royal Arms” had a broad shield above the motto “Advance Australia” and surmounted by the rising sun. It was flanked by an emu on the right and a kangaroo on the left both facing away and look over their shoulders. In the four segments of the shield were a three-masted ship, the golden fleece, crossed miner’s picks and a sheaf of wheat.

The origins of this coat of arms seem to be lost. It was certainly never granted “Royal Assent”, but it was used as early as the 1850’s as an unofficial Australian Coat of arms – well before Federation.

From time to time errors crept in!

In 1901 the kangaroo and emu changed sides and in 1912, 1914 and 1919 the kangaroo and emu turned their bodies toward each other but still refused to look at one another. However in 1923 and 1928 the emu got back in the original position but the kangaroo faced inwards again.

The ship and the golden fleece also changed sides now and again!

In 1935 came the first major change since 1885. The coat of arms was changed!

Still the kangaroo and emu on the left and right but now friends after fifty years, not only facing each other but, after a year or two (1937) the emu helping to support the shield. The rising sun had gone, replaced with a six (and sometimes seven) pointed star.

The shield had changed to a triangular style and this coat of arms was in fact the Federation Coat of Arms produced for the new Commonwealth in January 1901. It had been in use on some Australian coins since 1910 but it took thirty-four years before it was used on a South Australian "medal". Why it was used is again not known, but in that year with the introduction of regulations for Alsatian dogs and Canberra seeking to control their spread, perhaps it was thought opportune to support the Commonwealth.

However, in the meantime this early Coat of Arms had been officially replaced by the Commonwealth not once but twice - in 1908 by grant of Edward VII and again in 1912 by grant of George V to give us our present Australian Coat of Arms.

Eventually South Australia caught up and in 1966, after more than fifty years, used the present Commonwealth Coat of Arms and then only for three years.

From 1969 discs turned strictly functional. No embellishments at all except for 1972 and 1974 when the Piping Shrike suddenly appeared. This emblem first originated as a design in 1901 but was never officially adopted as a State emblem.

The leather loop disappeared in 1996 with the advent of plastic and these days we have a plastic self-fastening loop incorporated with the disc.

One elusive registration disc is that issued for Alsatian dogs. From 1934 until 1983 a separate distinctive disc was issued for Alsatis. The disc design shown on page 35 is typical.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

*A man went into a hotel and seated beside an Irishman at the bar was a huge dog.
"Does your dog bite?" he cautiously asked the Irishman.
"No," said the Irishman "he is as gentle as a lamb."
So the bloke patted the dog. The dog promptly bit him and nearly tore is arm off.
"You told me your dog didn't bite!" he screamed.
"Yes," said the Irishman, "but that's not my dog!"*

The 20th Century saw South Australian life change dramatically from horse and buggy, sailing ships, unfenced properties, small scattered communities and far flung police stations to the contraction of the modern, busy, sophisticated world we know today.

In one hundred years, only four Acts were passed - The Alsatian Dog Act 1934, the Registration of Dogs Act 1924 with various amendments up to 1971, the Dog Control Act in 1979 and the Dog & Cat Management Act 1995.

The baton was also passed on.

In 1922 responsibility for the Dog Act was passed from the Commissioner of Crown Lands, who had it for many years, to the Minister of Agriculture. But perhaps he thought it a "hot potato" because in just the next year it was transferred to the Minister for Local Government where it remains to this day.

The Alsatian Menace

As early as 1882 there was an Act to provide for the destruction of vermin.

"Vermin" included dingoes, dogs run wild and dogs at large. In those days it also included kangaroos and, of course, rabbits. It was "the duty of lessees to destruct vermin" and a bounty was paid of 10/- for a dog, 6d for a kangaroo and 2d for a rabbit.

In 1912 previous Acts were consolidated into the Wild Dog Act and a fund established, based on rates, to pay for tails and scalps. The Act included foxes, dingoes and dingo cross and also “a dog run wild”.

In 1927 The Graziers Association of Australia requested that the Commonwealth authorities prohibit the importation or breeding of Alsatian dogs. The Government called for a report but the report did not support the motion so in the following year the Graziers tried again.

“We view with much concern the increase in Alsatian dogs in Australia; and as a preliminary step towards their eradication, make further representation to the Federal Government with the view of prohibiting their entry into the Commonwealth.”

In 1929 the Commonwealth Government issued a proclamation prohibiting the importation of Alsatians for a period of five years and at the end of that period, further extended the ban. In 1934 they banned the entry of these dogs into the Northern Territory. This also included the breeding of them there.

However, the Commonwealth did not have the power to control dogs in the Federal States so it was left to South Australia to pass its own laws. On 12 September 1934 the member for Burra Burra, the Hon. G.F. Jenkins, rose to introduce The Alsatian Dog Bill.

The dog had been referred to as “the Alsatian Wolf Hound” but it was pointed out the correct name was “German Sheep Dog” and in France, the “Alsatian Shepherd Dog”. It was introduced to England after World War I and the name Alsatian adopted to avoid at that time referring to anything German.

As usual the Government of the day strongly supported the bill quoting evidence of Alsatians breeding with dingoes, attacking children, becoming “ruthless sheep killers” and having been “bred down from the early ancestry of the wolf”.

And as usual, the Opposition argued strongly against it. They said:-

There was no evidence of it evolving from wolves.
They were no more dangerous than other dogs.
Other dogs attacked sheep also.
They were intelligent and loyal and could be trained to work sheep.

Finally the Opposition was prepared to agree “that no Alsatian dog shall be allowed in areas outside District Council districts as being a fair compromise between the desires of the Alsatian breeders and the pastoralists.”

Then they fired the parting shot.

“At least unbiased men will admit that the case for the Alsatian is just as good as the case against it.”

The Act was assented to on 29 November 1934 but had considerable trouble defining the dogs to which it applied.

“Alsatian dog” means a dog, whether male or female, of any age, which is wholly or partly of the species or kind commonly known as “Alsatian dog” or “Alsatian wolf hound” or “belongs wholly or partly to any variety of the said species or kind by whatever name the variety may be known.”

In South Australia it applied to “that part of the State not comprised within a municipality or a District Council district” and could be extended by regulation to adjoining districts of necessary.

The registration fee was set at two pounds - for other dogs it was five shillings and seven and sixpence - a significant deterrent at eight times the normal cost!

A special disc was to be issued with the name “Alsatian” emblazoned on it and any person could destroy such a dog found outside council limits with no compensation payable.

This Act was in force for almost fifty years and was only repealed as late as 1983.

Registration of Dogs Act - 1924-1975

By 1924 it was obvious that, after seventy years, the “nuisance of dogs” had still not abated!

The Hon. R.T. Melrose, in discussion on a new bill said,

“One evening recently, when I was motoring in the suburbs of Adelaide, I counted twenty-two dogs on the road within a distance of eight miles. One very friendly old fellow introduced himself to a family of children by licking their faces and then knocked one of the youngsters sprawling. On one occasion I remember two dogs rushing at a motor car in which I was riding and the driver, in order to escape one of the animals, ran over the other, throwing the car right off the road. Had that happened in the City instead of the country, a serious accident might have resulted. I know of a case where a greyhound capsized a motor and one of the occupants of the car and the hound were pinned under the vehicle. The dog could just reach the man and tore him terribly. The man died a few weeks later, although I cannot say it was the result of that experience. Recently I saw a dog stretched across the pavement and a girl with a perambulator had to go right off the footpath to avoid the animal which, a few minutes later, rushed out at a trolley horse driven by a one-armed returned soldier.”

A new bill was passed to replace the previous one originally drafted in 1867.

Over the ensuing years there were many amendments. Special fees for female dogs were deleted and desexed dogs were to be described as “spayed”. Wandering bitches on heat were allowed to be killed up until the Act of 1979 but other dogs could only be killed if unclaimed, a danger to the public, caught worrying stock in an enclosed paddock or unable to be seized. All other cases were now to be referred to a Court.

Fines remained very low. In 1972 the were;

Registration (both sexes):	\$1.25
Owning unregistered dog:	\$4 to \$12
Owning bitch at large:	max of \$10
Endangering stock or persons:	\$4 to \$10

In 1948 Councils were permitted to make bylaws controlling dogs in public places and provision was made to exempt dogs’ “homes” and “places where dogs without an apparent owner are taken in and cared for.”

In 1966 the Act was further amended to provide for guide dogs. It was an offence to refuse entry, transport or accommodation to any blind person “by reason only that that person is accompanied by a guide dog.”

Dog Control Act – 1979

Mr Mathwin, a member of a select committee formed once again to report the current situation to parliament, stated “in twenty-two metropolitan areas investigations show there are 4,736 Alsatian dogs and 68,237 others registered and that one in three dogs are not registered. There is approximately one dog to three houses.” He also found there were many complaints of dogs fouling beaches and concluded by saying “a great failing among dog owners is their lack of responsibility.”

Mr. Virgo, when introducing the new Bill, said “this Bill imposes obligations on Councils to ensure more effort is devoted to problems of wandering and abandoned dogs and the nuisance caused by dogs.”

The Act, when handed down, had grown from the twelve pages of 1924 to some twenty-three pages, reflecting the legal challenges to the complexity of the subject. Also, for the first time, it was written in “plain English” - well almost!

A Dog Control Statutory Fund was established under an Advisory Committee. Money for the fund was to come from a portion of Councils’ registration fees and was to be used to support organizations like the RSPCA and the Animal Welfare League.

Councils were required to establish “pounds” for detaining stray animals and the Statutory Fund also contributed to these costs. It was declared an offence to have dogs in shops, schools or where food was prepared. Dogs with infectious diseases were to be treated, detained or destroyed and owners to pay costs.

The Act stated, “If a dog rushes at or chases any vehicle the person in control is guilty of an offence”. Surely it should have read “the person not in control”?.

After more than ninety years, dogs were again required to have a collar “legibly and indelibly endorsed or inscribed on it” the name and address of the owner of the dog.

Muzzles, for the first time since 1852, were again prescribed - but then only for greyhounds Councils also had the power to require “dogs of a certain class” to be tattooed.

Owners were required to “immediately remove the faeces of their dog if it defecates in public” and to dispose of it “in a lawful and suitable manner.” (understandably not specified!).

A dog was to be considered a nuisance if “it creates a noise which persistently occurs to such a degree that it unreasonably interferes with the peace, comfort or convenience of any person in any other premises”. A fertile field for defence lawyers no doubt!

Councils were given powers to limit the numbers of dogs kept and that in turn gave rise to extra clauses regarding the licensing of kennels.

The powers of the Courts were defined and repeat offenders could be denied the right to own a dog. Over the next 10 years there were no less than 140 amendments to this Act!

Dog & Cat Management Act – 1995

By 1995 the size of the Act had again increased. Together with its regulations it had doubled in size and now covered fifty-seven pages, no doubt to keep pace with the expansion of the legal fraternity.

The major change was the establishment of a statutory body under the control of the Minister and funded by a portion of registration fees. The previous Dog Advisory Committee was only to advise the Minister but the new Dog & Cat Management Board was a corporate body of seven persons “one at least to be a woman and one a man”.

It was the only statutory authority of its kind in Australia. It provide an opportunity to resolve breaches of the Act without needing to resort to a Court of Summary Jurisdiction.

Its clearly defined purpose was:

- To promote effective management of dogs and cats
- To advise councils on training of dog “catchers”, issuing of legal orders, facilities for detention and the keeping of registers
- To oversee application of bylaws
- To carry out research and education

To review the Act and advise the Minister of Local Government.

The emphasis was is a coordinated approach to educating the public and resolving difficulties. Councils’ responsibilities were clearly detailed and grounds for council orders defined.

Fines were substantially increased and for the most serious offence, that of inciting a dog to attack, gaol up to a maximum of two years was possible, although, as the parliamentary committee heard in 1884, magistrates had seldom, if ever prescribed maximum penalties.

For the first time, dangerous breeds of dogs were specified. These imported dogs were known fighting breeds and it was illegal to own them unless they were de-sexed and kept leashed and muzzled in public. Such a

prescribed breed could neither be sold or given away - in fact everything was controlled except outright prohibition!

One restriction from 1979 was relaxed however. As it had been in 1886 - collars were no longer required to be engraved with the owner's details!

The section of the Act relating to cats mirrored the Dog Act in the appointment of "control" officers. The destroying of cats in Wildlife Parks or "more than one kilometre from any genuine place of residence" was sanctioned as was euthanasia by specified and authorised persons. However as yet there is no registration of cats nor restrictions imposed on owners.

TODAY'S WORLD

*There is sorrow enough in the natural way
From men and women to fill our day:
And when we're certain of sorrow in store,
Why do we always arrange for more?
Brother and Sister, I bid you beware
Of giving your heart to a dog to tear*

From "The Power of the Dog" by Rudyard Kipling, 1865-1936

The problems of the 19th Century that precipitated the first dog control laws have gone. The farm paddocks are enclosed, a barrier fence in the north of the State keeps out the dingo, houses are fenced with secure gates and packs of dogs are no longer seen wandering loose in the street "both by day and by night" as they once did.

But the need for laws to control the owners of dogs is just as necessary today as ever it was. In South Australia in the last year over 11,000 dogs wandering at large were impounded! Unregistered dogs may no longer be killed on sight but in the year 2004, Councils throughout the State were obliged to dispose of over 5000 of them!

Pet Care Australia records indicate there are 318 00 dogs in South Australia and although almost 300,000 dogs were registered in 2004, that still leaves 18,000 unaccounted for!

But more seriously, the confining of dogs to indoors and small yards, limiting their exercise to the length of a leash and the indiscriminate sale of puppies has resulted in an increase of dogs attacking people, particularly children. Councils receive over 2000 complaints of attacks and harassment each year. Between 1996 and 2004 there was an average of 1,800 dog attacks per year reported to Councils where physical injury actually occurred.

Despite a public education programme over the last five years which has absorbed almost a million dollars of pet owners money, these statistics show it is now necessary to continue to revise the Act.

Recent recommendations to parliament have included:

- All dogs on a leash in public.
- Penalties for parents whose dog attacks an unsupervised child.
- Irresponsible owners banned from owning a dog.
- Dogs considered a menace to be muzzled.
- Pet shops banned from selling large types of dog.
- Guard dogs to be permanently identified.
- An increase in registration fees and penalties.

Since 1999, the identification of a "dog attack" has now been widened to include not only injuries but also harassment which is defined as

"a situation involving a dog that causes the complainant a degree of fear and anxiety that would have resulted in an attack were it not for the evasive actions of an individual."

There were over 2000 such attacks reported last year!

Despite the efforts of law makers over the last 150 years the underlying problems remain:

The difficulties in strictly policing the Act
The emotive issue of destroying dogs
The restrictions on owners and their pet, supposedly “man’s best friend”
The resentment of non-dog owners faced with problems of fear of attack, barking and howling dogs, faeces pollution and other pets being harassed.
The problems of educating both owners and dogs to adopt acceptable behaviour.

So the Act for “abating the nuisance and damage occasioned by the great number of dogs in the Province” is still as necessary today as it was when first proclaimed in 1852 in order that dogs and people live together in harmony.

EPILOGUE

*Dog is the furry simile for our finer emotions.
Dog is fidelity, bravery, selfless devotion, love and
instinctual sagacity.
Dog’s gifts are seen as discerning character, sensing danger
and duplicity.
Dog is the symbol of constancy and family.
Dogs are for every class, every nation, every occupation.*

*Dog can do no wrong, though he can be misused by wicked man.
Dog is endlessly forgiving and loving and loyal.
Dog comforts the sick and lonely, protects the weak and needy.
Dog leads the blind and supports the halt.
Dog is the good shepherd.
And when time comes for us to pass on,
Dog will mourn for us and visit our graves.*

Nick Cubbin, The Weekend Australian Magazine, 3/8/2002

APPENDICES

Chronology

List of Districts, Councils & Municipalities

List of Registrars – 1885

District 204

Early Place Names

Medal Styles

CHRONOLOGY

1841	First exercise in dog control
1852	First Act (No.5)
1855	Letter re dogs killed
1860	New Act (No. 9) & Amendment 1861 (No 9) First District list
1861-1863	District Registration returns
1867	New Act (No. 6)
1868	District List gazetted
1875	District List gazetted
1878	District List gazetted
1879	District List gazetted
1882	District List gazetted - Vermin Act (No. 202)
1884	Select Committee - Amendment to Act of 1867 (No. 320)
1885	District List gazetted – First metal (brass) disk
1886	District List gazetted - First disk with two holes
1888	Act to Amend (No. 429)
1889	Act to Amend (No. 465)
1892	District List gazetted
1912	Wild Dog Act passed
1922	Transferred to Minister of Agriculture
1923	Transferred to Minister of Local Government
1924	Bill discussed in Parliament, New Act (No. 1615), Registration of Dogs Act
1929	Amended 1924 Act (No. 1893)
1933	District List gazetted
1934	Alsatian Dogs bill discussed in Parliament. Control of Alsatian Dogs Act (No. 2189)
1935	Early Federal coat of Arms appears on disks
1948	Amended 1924 Act (No. 21)
1957	Amendments 1924 Act (No. 40)
1966	Present Australian Coat of Arms appears, Amendments 1924 Act (No. 57)
1968	Amendments 1924 Act (No. 37)
1969	Coat of Arms disappears
1971	Amendments 1924 Act (No. 89)
1975	Registration of Dogs Act 1924 consolidated 1924 - 1975
1979	District List Gazetted - Dog Control Act (No. 48)
1983	Alsatian Dogs Act repealed
1995	Dog and Cat Management Act (No. 15)
2002	District List gazetted

APPENDIX 2

Numerical list of Proclaimed Districts Councils and Municipalities for the purpose of the Dog Act in South Australia

District Number	Location	Date Proc.
	Corporations	
1	Palmerston N.T.– Outback areas Community Development Trust	1885
2	Southport N.T. – Wakefield Regional Council	1885
3	Yam Creek N.T. Burrandie N.T. Copper Coast	1885 1892
4	Daly Waters N.T. Katherine N.T. Roxby Downs	1885 1892
5	Barrow’s Creek N.T. Alice Springs N.T. Northern Areas Council	1885 1892
6	Borooloola N.T.	1892
7	Campbelltown	1947
8	Payneham (Now Norwood Payneham & St Peters)	1947
9	Whyalla	1945
10	Walkerville	1945
11	Marion	1944
12	Enfield (Now Port Adelaide Enfield)	1944
13	West Torrens	1944
14	Mitcham	1944
15	Renmark (Now Renmark Paringa)	?
16	Burnside	1936
17	Prospect	1934
18	Woodville (Now Charles Sturt)	?
19	Port Elliot	1925
20	Murray Bridge	1924
21	Naracoorte	1924
22	Port Lincoln	1921
23	Garden Suburb (Col. Light Gardens)	1921
24	Port Augusta West	1868
25	Victor Harbour	1914
26	Davenport	?
27	Petersburg (Now Peterborough)	1884
28	Semaphore Henley & Grange	1884 1916
29	Quorn Kanyaka Quorn	1885 1969
30	St Peters	1883
31	Maitland Adelaide Hills	1883
32	Gladstone	1883
33	Thebarton	1883
34	Laura	1882
35	Edithburgh	1882
36	Port Wakefield	1881
37	Yorketown	1879
38	Jamestown	1878
39	Port Pirie	1876
40	Burra	1876
41	Mt Gambier	1876
42	Pt Augusta	1875
43	Hindmarsh	1874
44	Walleroo	1874
45	Goolwa	1872
46	Kadina	1872
47	Moonta	1872
48	Unley	1871
49	Clare	1868
50	Strathalbyn	1868
51	Adelaide	1851
52	Brighton (Now Holdfast Bay)	1858
53	Gawler	1857
54	Glenelg	1857
55	Kapunda corporation	1865
56	Kensington & Norwood	1853
57	Port Adelaide	1855
	District Councils & Drainage Districts	
58	Aldinga District Willunga	1857 1933
59	Alexandrina Central Yorke Peninsula	1861 1969
60	Angaston	1869
61	Barossa East Minlaton	1856 1888
62	Barossa West Barossa	1856 1888
63	Belvidere	1866
64	Bremer	1867
65	Brighton Marion	1867 1933
66	Burnside	1861
67	Clare & Gilbert Valley Clare	1868 1967
68	Clarendon	1869
69	Crafers	1866
70	East Torrens	1853
71	Echunga	1866
72	Encounter Bay	1866
73	Flaxman’s Valley	1869

	Broughton Redhill	1888 1933
74	Gilbert Riverton	1874 1933
75	Wirrega Snowtown	1884 1888
76	Highercombe	1853
77	Woodville	1876
78	Kapunda District (Now Kapunda & Light)	1866
79	Kondoparinga	1861
80	Light Gawler South	1867 1899
81	Macclesfield (Now Onkaparinga)	1861
82	Mitcham	1867
83	Morphett Vale	1856
84	Mount Barker	1861
85	Mount Crawford	1854
86	Mount Gambier East Mount Gambier	1876 1933
87	Mt Gambier West	1876
88	Mudla Wirra North	1876
89	Mudla Wirra South Mudla Wirra	1867 1934
90	Munno Para East Munno Para (Now Playford)	1853 1854
91	Munno Para West	1854
92	Myponga Pt Germain Mt Remarkable	1856 1888 ?
93	Nairne	1853
94	Noarlunga	1869
95	Nuriootpa Freeling	1867 1933
96	Onaunga	1867
97	Onkaparinga	1853
98	Para Wirra	1854
99	Campbelltown	1868
100	Port Elliot & Golwa (Now Alexandrina)	1876
101	Port Gawler (Now Mallala)	1856
102	Caurnamont	1885
103	Queenstown & Alberton Renmark Irrigation. Trust	1879 1902
104	Rapid Bay	1856
105	Rhynie	1856
106	South Rhine Springton (Now Mt Pleasant)	1865 1888
107	Payenham	1883
108	Stockport	1865
109	Strathalbyn	1868
110	Talunga (Later Gumeracha)	1853
111	Tanunda (Now Barossa)	1855
112	Tea Tree Gully	1858
113	Tungkillo	1855
114	Upper Wakefield Saddleworth & Alburn	1868 ?
115	Walkerville	1855

116	West Torrens	1853
117	Willunga	1853
118	Yankallila	1861
119	Yatala North Salisbury	1868 1934
120	Stanley	1868
121	Black Springs Wilmington	1868 1888
122	Hamilton	1874
123	Saddleworth	1868
124	Waterloo	1868
125	Yatala South	1868
126	Penola (Now Wattle Range)	1869
127	Port MacDonnell (Now Grant)	1869
128	Robe	1869
129	Naracoorte (Now Naracoorte & Lucindale)	1870
130	Alma Plains	1870
131	Green's Plains Kadina	1871 1933
132	Blyth	1872
133	?	
134	Prospect	1872
135	Hanson	1872
136	Burra Goyder	1872 1969
137	Lacepede	1873
138	Apoinga	1873
139	North Rhine Keyneton & Swan Reach	1873 1934
140	Dublin	1873
141	Grace	1874
142	Julia	1874
143	Mt Bryan	1874
144	Dalkey Owen	1875 1933
145	Booborowie	1875
146	Palmerston	1874
147	Belalie (Now Jamestown)	1875
148	Melville Yorke Peninsula Yorketown	1875 1876 1933
149	Booyoolie Laura	1876 1933
150	Narridy Kanyaka	1876 1888
151	Georgetown	1876
152	Tatiara	1876
153	Gladstone	1876
154	Truro	1876
155	Birkenhead (Kennion) Beachport	1887 1933
156	Rosewater Renmark Town	1877 1933
157	Mannum (Now Mid Murray	1877
158	Hallett	1877
159	Dalrymple	1877
160	Balaklava	1877

161	Caltowie	1878
162	Lucindale	1878
163	Neales Eudunda	1878 1933
164	English Robertstown	1878 1933
165	Hall	1878
166	Kulpara Bute (Now Barunga West)	1878 1933
167	Port Wakefield	1878
168	Clinton	1878
169	Mt Muirhead Drainage District	?
170	Lincoln (Now Lower Eyre Peninsula)	1880
171	Beachport	1882
172	Mayurra Drainage District Millicent	1882 1933
173	Tantanoola Drainage District	1882
174	Monarto	1882
175	Crystal Brook	1882
176	Yongala	1883
177	Stirling	1883
178	Mobilong	1884
179	Spalding	1885
180	Hutt & Hill Rivers	1885
181	Angas	1885
182	Benara	1885
183	Woolundunga	1888
184	Hawker (Now Flinders Rangers)	1888
185	Peterborough Coglin	1888 1933
186	Carrieton	1888
187	Orroroo (Now Orroroo Carrieton)	1888
188	Terowie	1888
189	Morgan	1888
190	Blanchetown	1888
191	Meningie (Now Coorong)	1888
192	Kingscote (Now Kangaroo Island)	1888
193	Franklin Harbour	1888
194	Elliston	1888
195	Streaky Bay	1888
196	Dudley	1933
197	Warooka	1889
198	Mundoora Port Broughton	1892 1933
199	Pirie	1892
200	Condowie Plains Streaky Bay	1886 1892
201	Portecra (Hd of Hynam) Fowlers Bay	1885 1892
202	Pt Wakefield Morgan	1878 1886
203	Bungarce Lochaber Overland Corner	1878 1886 1892

204	Walleroo Mines	1878
205	Near Wallaroo Penang Coonalpyn	1878 1886 1892
206	Moonta Renmark	1878 1892
207	Port Lincoln Farina	1878 1892
208	Venus Bay Waukaringa	1878 1892
209	Streaky Bay Near Mannum	1878 1892
210	Fowlers Bay Pt. Augusta West	1878 1892
211	Worlds End Wonoka	1878 1892
212	Blanchetown East Wellington	1878 1892
213	Overland Corner	1878
214	Mongolata	1878
215	Point Pass Baldina Blinman	1878 1886 1892
216	Wellington Oodnadatta	1878 1892
217	Meningie Beltana	1878 1892
218	Mundalla Custon	1878 1886
219	Robe Warcovie	1878 1892
220	Rivoli Bay Beachport Cowell	1878 1886 1892
221	Tarpeena	1878
222	Melrose Paratoo	1878 1892
223	Stirling North	1878
224	Farina Matt	1878 1892
225	Warooka	1878
226	Virginia Diamentina	1878 1892
227	Cygnets River (KI) Mt Eba	1878 1892
228	Winninnie Waukaringa Mt Freeling	1878 1886 1892
229	Port MacDonnell Yunta	1878 1892
230	Point McLeay Kingston	1878 1886
231	Mannum Maree	1878 1892
232	Kulpara Lochiel Strangway Springs	1878 1886 1892
233	Wilmington Charlotte Waters	1878 1892
234	Hogletton	1878

	Port Augusta West	1886
235	Koolunga Manna Hill	1878 1892
236	Redhill Tilleys Swamp	1878 1892
237	Crystal Brook	1878
238	Keilli Mundoora	1878 1886
239	Appila-Yareowie Yarrowie	1878 1886
240	Pt Pirie West	1878
241	Telowie	1878
242	Whyte – Yarcowie	1878
243	Maitland	1878
244	Port Vincent	1878
245	Wonoka	1878
246	Yacka	1878
247	Yongala Parnaroo	1878 1886
248	Yatina	1878
249	Pekina	1878
250	Orroroo Brinkley	1878 1933
251	Spalding Canowie Tumby Bay	1878 1886 1933
252	Barunga Sharp's Well Lameroo (Now Southern Mallee)	1878 1886 1933
253	Kalkabury Authurton Loxton (Now Loxton Waikerie)	1878 1886 1933
254	Ardrossan Cleve	1886 1933
255	Mount Rat Peake	1886 1933

256	Minlaton Pinnaroo	1886 1933
257	Minlacowie Brentwood Waikerie	1878 1886 1933
258	Warrow Browns Well	1886 1933
259	Napperby Warnertown Paringa	1878 1886 1933
260	Tarcowie Karoonda (Now Karoonda East Murray)	1886 1933
261	Hog Bay River (KI) Berri (Now Berri Barmera)	1886 1933
262	East Wellington East Murray	1886 1933
263	Lancelot Coldogla Barmera	1886 1933 1975
264	Willochra Kimba	1886 1933
265	Yabmana Franklin Harbour Minnipa Le Hunte	1878 1886 1925 1933
266	Mattawarrangala Murat Bay Ceduna	1886 1925
267	Wandearah East Coonalpyn Downs	1886 1975
268	Morchard Elizabeth	1886 1964
269	Terowie Monarto Development Corp	1886 1975
270	Blinman Cooper Pedy	1886 1886

Note: for further details of numbers 200 to 341 refer to Appendix 4

APPENDIX 3

List of Registrars – 1885

The following list of persons were appointed by the Commissioner of Crown Lands to be registrars of dogs under the Dog Acts 1867 and 1884, for districts under the Government (not being within the limits of corporate towns or districts under the Councils Act, 1876, or under the South-Eastern Drainage Act, 1878).

No. of Districts	Name of Registrar	Situation of Office
200	W.H. Skewes	Condowie Plains
201	Henry Inglis	Portecra, hundred Hynam
202	James R. Rowe	Telegraph Office, Morgan
203	John Noble	Bungaree, near Claire
204	W.H. Williams	Wallaroo Mines
205	J.J. Andrewartha	Penang
206	N.D. Bennett	Moonta
207	W.O. Bennett	Port Lincoln Court House
208	The officer in charge of the police Station (<i>ex officio</i>)	Police Station, Parkin, Venus Bay
209	Ditto	Police Station, Streaky Bay
210	Ditto	Police Station, Fowler's Bay
211	Jane Duell	World's End Creek Post Office
212	W. Jewell	Blanchetown Telegraph Office
213	The telegraph station-master	Overland Corner Telegraph Office
214	H.S. Stephens	Mongolata Post Office
215	Richard Klabe	Baldina
216	Rebecca Carter	Wellington
217	J.M. Ferry	Meningie
218	C.W. Richards	Custon
219	W. Warren	Robe
220	Thomas Brimage	Custom House, Beachport
221	L. Egan	Tarpeena
222	A.F. Andrews	Melrose Court House
223	Francis Coventry	Stirling North
224	The officer in charge of the police station (<i>ex officio</i>)	Police Station, Farina Town, Government Gums
225	C.S. Keightley	Warooka
226	John Nash	Virginia
227	Arthur Daw	Cygnets River, Kangaroo Island
228	The officer in charge of the police station (<i>ex officio</i>)	Police Station, Waukaringa, North-East
229	W.T. Jones	Port MacDonnell
230	Chas. Crump	Kingston
231	E. Haby	Near Mannum
232	Maria J. Bradley	Lochiel Post Office
233	H.W. Mastermar	Wilmington Local Court
234	James Bryant	Port Augusta West
235	Jno. Little	Koolunga
236	A.N. Hopkins	Redhill Post Office
237	Patrick G. Kevill	Section 262, Crystal Brook
238	T. Watt	Mundoora Post Office
239	A. Graham	Yarrowie
240	Alfred Pearce	Port Pirie West
241	A. Carmichael	Telowie
242	H.J. Conlon	Maitland
244	Fredrick W. Luxmoore	Port Vincent
245	A.J. Scott	Post Office, Wonoka
246	S.H. Pelton	Yacka
247	Harry Smith	Parnaroo Post Office
248	J.B. Carr	Yatina Post Office
249	M. Duffy	Pekina Post Office
250	B. Pullen	Local Court, Orroroo
251	T.H. Dunstan	Spalding
252	J. Weldon	Sharp's Wells
253	Henry Jones	Arthurton
255	F.B. Peterson	Ardrossan Post Office
256	Frederick E. Bak	Minlaton
257	James Mudge	Brentwood Post Office
258	F.A.C. Ferber, jun	Warrow Post Office
259	W.H. Parr	Warnertown Post Office
260	W.E. Gosling	Tarcowie
261	Thomas Wilson, jun.	Hog Bay River, Kangaroo Island
262	W.N. Ingham	Rosaville, West Gambier
263	G. Jenkins	Lancelot

264	E.A. Stocks	Post Office, Willochra
265	Wm. Forbes	Franklin Harbor
266	Jas. Baird	Mattawurrangala
267	Eliza Lawson	Post Office, Wandearah West
268	C. Longbotham	Morchard
269	Edwin Stephens	Terowie
270	The Postmaster	Blinman Post Office
271	The Postmaster	Police Station, Peake
272	T.H. Button	Cradock
273	Fredk. T. Read	Yanyarrie Whim
274	A. McArthur	Port Victoria
275	Jas. McGregor	Oladdie Post Office
276	J.N. Williams	Quorn Court House
277	Samuel Smedley	Curramulka Post Office
278	F.M. Buttfield	Beltana
279	F.H.Rix	Hammond
280	The Postmaster	Mount Bryan East
281	The officer in charge police station (<i>ex officio</i>)	Elliston
282	John Stokes	Amyton
283	E.T. Peate	Eurelia
284	R. Bourne	Gordon
285	G. Badger	Dawson Post Office
286	J.C. James	Johnburgh Post Office
287	Chas. B Walters	Richman's Creek Post Office
288	Victor Callier	Winninowie
289	T. Battersby	Yalpara Post Office
290	Thos. Lukeman	Tickera Post Office
291	A.W. King	Arkaba
292	J.D. Miller	Post Office, Miller's Point
293	Arthur E. Goslin	Mannanarie Post Office
294	The Postmaster	Mount Templeton
295	J. Rintoul	Wirrabara Post Office
296	N. Simons	Port Germein
297	W.B. Towler	Snowtown
298	S. Robinson	Levens
299	T. Simpson	Hog Bay Post Office
300	S.J. Allen	Murray Bridge Post Office
301	T. Barber	Upland Farm, near Cairn Bank, Via Kingston
303	G. Phillis	Mambray Creek Post Office
304	E. Gertig	Bundey Post Office
305	W. Davidson	King Post Office
306	P.E.Kelly	Boolcunda East
307	J. Howard	Cavenagh Post Office
308	Thos. Terry	Paratoo Post Office
309	Thos. B. Hawson	Wangary Post Office
310	F. Matty	Near Franklyn

311	Charles Dyer	Booleroo Centre Post Office
312	Robert G. Crundwell	Angle Grove Post Office
313	H. M. Peel	Port Broughton Post O
314	W. James	Belton Post Office
315	M. Gallivan	Wilson Post Office
316	J. Y. Barclay	Corny Point Post Office
317	The Postmaster	Willow Plains
318	James Brown	Binum
319	M. Burke	Crower, hun. Conmurra, via Lucindale
320	P.O. Jacka	Willowie East
321	James Bradley	Mount Mary
322	F. W. Drogemul	Post Office, Milendella
323	James Barclay	Collinsfield
324	The officer in charge of the Police station (<i>ex officio</i>)	Eudunda
325	The Postmaster	Walloway
326	Hugh Bawden	Hun. Muloowurtie
327	C. H. Yates	Uroonda
328	James Sears	Rossawella, near Carnamont
329	The officer in charge of the Police station (<i>ex officio</i>)	Diamantina
330	The officer in charge of the Police station (<i>ex officio</i>)	Mount Vivian
331	The officer in charge of the Police station (<i>ex officio</i>)	Mount Freeling
332	The officer in charge of the Police station (<i>ex officio</i>)	Winnininnie
333	The officer in charge of the Police station (<i>ex officio</i>)	Innamincka
334	The Postmaster	Hergott Springs (Marree)
335	The Postmaster	Strangways Springs
336	The Postmaster	Charlotte Waters
337	The officer in charge of the Police station (<i>ex officio</i>)	Yardea
338	J.E. Creasy	Lower Broughton
339	The Postmaster	Peela Weela
340	The Postmaster	Willamulka
341	The Postmaster	Sandy Point

APPENDIX 4

District 204

Illustrating the difficulty in defining some areas, this one near Wallaroo - Kadina

District No. 204. – Commencing at the north-western corner of the Hundred of Cameron; thence south and west, by the western boundary of the Hundred of Kulpara, to its north-west corner; thence westerly and southerly, along the northern and western boundaries of the District of Green's Plains, to the south boundary of the Hundred of Kadina; thence west to the south-west corner of said Hundred; thence north along the west boundary of the Hundred of Kadina, to a point east of the south-east corner of Section 270, Hundred of Wallaroo; thence west to a point south of the south-west corner of the said Section; thence north, along the west boundaries of 124, 125, 126, 362, 361, to its north corner; thence north-westerly and north-easterly, by the south-western boundaries of 160c and 160D, and north westerly boundaries of 160D, 658, 657, to the south-western boundary of 743; thence north-westerly and northerly, along the south-western boundary of 743 and western boundaries of 743, 742, 739, 53, 665, 664, and the production north of the west boundary of the latter Section, to the north boundary of the Hundred of Wallaroo; thence west, along the north boundary of the said Hundred to Point Riley; thence in a north-easterly, south-easterly, and southerly direction, by the sea-coast, to a point on the southern shore of Mundoora Arm, about two miles south of Port Broughton; thence south-easterly, by a straight line, to a point of commencement, exclusive of the corporate town of Kadina.

APPENDIX 5

Early Place Names

Wirreanda - Hd. Of Craddock, Native for 'Rock Wallaby Gum Tree'.
Bramfield – East of Elliston, From a town in Suffolk. Originally a sheep run.
Condowie Plains – SW of Brinkworth, Native reference to “good water”.
Mongolata – NE of Burra
Government Gums – Later became Farina, a siding on the line to Maree
Winninnie – Rail siding on the Broken Hill Line
Keilli – Formally Broughton Extension, 10 km SW of Redhill
Yarrowie – Now Appila NW from Jamestown
Wonoka – NW of Hawker, native for “A daughter”
Yatina – Native name meaning Black Rock, E of Peterborough
Kalkabury – Now Arthurton on Yorke Peninsula
Mount Rat – S of Maitland – Kangaroo rats were once common
Lancelot – E of Peterborough in the Hd of Gumbowie after Sir Lancelot Stirling MLC
Morchard – W of Orroroo – from Morchard in W Devon.
Minlacowie – (Hd. of) Yorke Peninsula – Aboriginal for “good water”
Booyoolie – Hd of Booyoolie – Gladstone - after an early property
Neales – Hd of Neales near Eudunda after John Bentham Neales MP
English – Hd of English, near Point Pass from Thomas English, twice mayor of Adelaide
Lochaber – NW of Naracoorte, from Lochaber in Invernesshire
Baldina – Hd of Baldina near Burra
Custon – S of Wolsley in SE – The Rev Purey - Cust married one of Gov. Jervis’s daughters
Bundey – Hd of Bundey near Florieton named after an MP & judge
Paratoo – On the Broken Hill line SW of Yunta
Willow Plains – E of Hawker
Mannanarie – N of Jamestown
Levens – now Leavens Beach W of Pt. Turton, Yorke Peninsula
King – Hd of King, E of Burra after Thos King MP
Cavenagh – Hd of Cavenagh E of Orroroo, named after an MP
Petersburg – Original name of Peterborough, after Peter Doecke who founded the town
Flaxmans Valley – NW of Eden Valley, 28,000 acres brought by Chas. Flaxman for Geo Fife Angus
Mudla Wirra North – From the Hd Mudla Wirra near Wasleys
Portland Estate – early subdivision near Port Adelaide in the 1850’s
Stanley – Hd of Stanley NW of Robertstown
Alma Plains – N of Hamley Bridge after a battle in the Crimean War
Apoinga – NW of Robertstown
Grace – Hd of Grace (Mallala) from Grace Farrell, wife of first colonial chaplain
Julia – Now Julia Greek NW of Eudunda after a daughter of Gov. Gawler
Dalkey – SE of Balaklava
Sharps Well – Later Wokurna North, N of Bute
Amyton – NW of Hammond
Richman’s Creek – Now Richman Valley S of Quorn from Henry Richman an early pastoralist
Yalpara – East of Orroroo
Everard Central – SE of Lochiel after Wm. Everard a prominent pioneer
Franklyn – Station property E of Terowie
Willowie East – Between Wilmington & Orroroo
Wrenfordsley – Hd of Wrenfordsley – Seale Bay, West Coast after Sir Henry Wrenfordsley, Chief Justice of W.A.
Walloway – NW of Orroroo, a rail Siding
Uroonda – Hd of Uroonda – N of Carrieton
Caunamount – Between Walkers Flat & Purnong - From England – the name of Robert Thompsons sheep station.
Peela Weela – Peela Weela Bore now Alford
Willamulka – Rail siding between Kadina & Bute
Nugent – Foul Bay Yorke Peninsula

Information sourced from Rodney Cockburn’s “What’s in a name” and the Department of Lands.