by the drainage of spruce and cedar swamps. At the outlet of the lowest pond once stood a village called Hallockville, which operated a grist mill, sundry sawmills, and what was then the largest tannery in Massachusetts. It was burned in 1846 and never rebuilt, and the dams and foundation walls are now almost destroyed and buried by a new growth of forest. But the sluice and flood stream below are still clogged with the sawdust and tan bark deposited a half century ago, and the water is black and forbidding, though much broken into swirls and rapids by boulders and ledges. But for the colour of the water, it is a most likely looking place for trout, though it has been tested time and time again without successful results. It has always been maintained, from the date of the building of the tannery, that there were no trout in it. I used to fish it myself when I was a boy. Last summer I took therefrom five small trout with a worm. They had doubtless worked their way up from the Buckland streams below, for they never came through the dam from the pickerel ponds above. Nevertheless, the lower streams are occupied by many sawmills, and carry their proportion of sawdust, that substance which some of your correspondents maintain is fatal to fish life. I leave your readers to draw their inferences, and trust that Mr. Fred. Mather will feel himself sustained by this testimony of the streams. That gentleman is not apt to make mistakes. He is grey with the experience of years, and that is better than guess work.

WASHINGTON, *December 29th.* CHARLES HALLOCK.

In this same year (1889) a very remarkable report on this subject was sent to the Hon. C. H. Tupper, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa, by W. H. Rogers, late Inspector of Fisheries for Nova Scotia. The report did not appear among the State papers, and it was consequently published in Halifax under the title of "*The Suppressed Sawdust Report.*" No one can read this pamphlet without being staggered with the mass of information which is supplied to prove the harmlessness of sawdust, and the marvel is that the Minister did not order a thorough investigation to be made into the whole subject.

Of course, diametrically opposite views were expressed by other fishery officers, in whose judgment, no doubt, the Minister had perfect confidence. For example, Mr. S. Wilmot, the Superintendent of the Dominion Fish Hatcheries, wrote a very vigorous report denouncing the deadly effects of sawdust, and his opinions were certainly entitled to some weight. But there was this marked difference between the reports of the two officers: Mr. Rogers' was bristling with facts and observations based evidently upon first hand knowledge of the subject, whereas Mr. Wilmots' report showed no close acquaintance with it.

Turning again to the reports of the United States Fish Commissioner, we do not find any further reference to sawdust until 1892, when Mr. Hugh M. Smith again reports upon "The fisheries of the Great Lakes." At page 404 he says:—"At first white fish and trout were both abundant. . . . Since 1881 or 1882 they have been comparatively scarce. . . . The gill-net fishermen lay the blame on the small meshed pound-nets. The pound-net fishermen, on the other hand