

the Act we found means of complying with the letter of the law. No doubt it involved great expense, which we would gladly have avoided, but still we found means to dispose of the saw-dust. The contention made on behalf of the mill-owners of the Maritime provinces, is much stronger than any claim put forward on behalf of the mill-owners at Ottawa. You must remember that the lumber that is sawn there is largely spruce. It is not worth more than 50 per cent of the value of the pine lumber that is manufactured here, consequently the percentage of cost in making the change was much heavier there than it would be at the Ottawa mills. If such a nuisance is tolerated, under the eyes of Parliament, and the law is not enforced here, you will find that the people of the Maritime provinces will have just cause to complain, and will remove their chutes, from under the mills, and allow the saw-dust to run into the river, utterly destroying the fisheries as has been done here. Our fisheries are valuable : they tell that yours were at one time quite as valuable here. We cannot afford to pay anything like as much for changing our mills in proportion to the value of our lumber as they can here. Therefore, I say the excuse of expense should not be tolerated. What we can do, and what we have been compelled by the law to do, should be enforced in every section of this Dominion. It has been stated that an exception should be made in the case of the St. John because it is an international river. How far should that apply? True, a certain portion of it is on the United States side, but how far up the St. John river do you go before you meet that? I think it is close on 200 miles, and then it only bounds the state of Maine for a short distance. Suppose the mill-owners up there put saw-dust in the river on the United States side, how much would that affect the fisheries on our side? I contend that the saw-dust entering the St. John River will affect their portion only. It will not extend to our side. For 150 miles up the river the law is enforced on both sides and in all the tributaries, as it is on the Miramichi and other rivers in New Brunswick. On the St. John River as it now stands, and I presume the law is fully enforced there, the fisheries have seven-eighths of the bed of the river that will be free from saw-dust and pollution, and it will make perfectly clean spawning beds for the fish. To appoint fishery officers to protect the fisheries, to ap-

propriate money for breeding fish and then to put the fish in polluted streams where they will die within 24 hours, is throwing away money in a manner which should not for a moment be tolerated. The case of the St. John River will not bear investigation ; the cost of changing the mills will not bear investigation, and there is no impossibility about being able to dispose of all the saw-dust here, as we have done for many years down in the lower provinces, at all events during all my experience in the saw-mill business in the Maritime provinces.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—I should like to ask the hon. gentleman who it is that enforces the act in these cases?

Hon. Mr. SNOWBALL—I think the fisheries inspectors. In fact I do not know who would enforce it.

The motion was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. CLEMOW moved :—

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General ; praying that His Excellency will cause to be made a survey of the Ottawa River, from the Chaudière Falls to the mouth of the Gatineau River, at as early a date as possible, to ascertain the localities, depth and extent of the deposit of saw-dust, mill or other refuse in that part of the river above indicated ; and that plans and profiles of such survey be furnished to the Senate immediately after completion.

He said : This is in order to find out whether, from the evidence of the last survey, this nuisance continued unabated, or whether it has decreased. It has been stated in some quarters that the spring freshets remove a great deal of the saw-dust. We can find by actual examination whether such is the fact or not. In my opinion, and from the best evidence I can obtain, the spring freshet has no such effect. The saw-dust continues to extend. It sinks in the river, and you will find, by an additional survey, that the deposits have very much increased. I think it highly necessary to have information before the House if the question should come to be fully considered. I am not going to enter into the merits or demerits of the case until the papers come before us. The nuisance has continued for a good many years, and the sooner it is abated the better. Mr. Edwards, of New Edinburgh, has made arrangements in his mill by which he burns the saw-dust, and if it can be done by him on the Rideau River it can be done by the