

threw the responsibility on the saw mills and the gill-net men. The saw mills, they say, pollute the waters with sawdust and vegetable refuse, and the gill-net men lose a great many nets, which with the fish in them soon decay and become a putrid mass, which contaminates the fishing grounds, and causes the fish to leave for other places."

Comparing this with his report for 1887 it will be seen that Mr. Smith refrains from asserting any ill effects from sawdust, and places the responsibility for such statements upon the fishermen. A similar remark applies to the International Fish Commissioner's report for 1893, and to the report of Mr. Richard Rathbun in 1899 on the "Fisheries in the Contiguous Waters of the State of Washington and British Columbia." "Attention," he says, "has been especially called to the Skagit river, on whose banks there are numerous shingle mills, from which a very large amount of refuse is allowed to enter the water. According to the statements of the fishermen in that region this practice has caused a great deal of damage to the spawning grounds of the salmon and has affected the fishery in other ways."

Coming to 1899 we find a very important report from the Dominion Fish Commissioner, Professor Prince, and one from the Deputy Commissioner for the Province of Ontario, Mr. Bastedo. Both reports command attention from the fact that they take opposite sides upon the sawdust question. Professor Prince says: "So far as our present knowledge goes, sawdust pollution, if it does not affect the upper waters, the shallow spawning and hatching grounds, appears to do little harm to the adult fish in their passage up from the sea." . . . "There is no case on record of salmon, or shad, or any other healthy adult fish being found choked with sawdust or in any way fatally injured by the floating particles."

Again, in summing up his conclusions upon all forms of pollutions: "In the first place it is evident that circumstances modify the effects of all forms of pollutions, so that waste matters which would be deadly in one river will pass away and prove of little harm in another, where the conditions are different. In the second place it shows how varied are the effects of various waste products under the same conditions upon different species of fish. Salmon will survive unharmed where shad and gasperaux would be killed off. Further, these notes indicate how little is actually known of the effects upon fish life of these various pollutions from accurate and thoroughly scientific experiments."

Contrast with this Mr. Bastedo's opinion as published in his report