

thorough progeny of the true salmon (*Salmo salar*) which form so valuable a product of the sea coast and tidal river fishings in other parts of the Dominion. 'Their identity is an ascertained certainty,' says the official report, 'in spite of a doubt which is known to exist in the minds of many persons, and demonstrating that the commercial value of fish so bred renders the subject of its increased production worthy of greater attention. Grilse, or in other words, two-year-old salmon, of the experimental hatching of 1866, having revisited the creek in the fall of 1868, are actual progenitors of part of the present large hatch of salmon fry. The female grilse is not known to propagate on her first migration from sea, but the male does. The few full grown stock fish, male and female, which were last autumn accompanied by the large number of grilse returning to the stream, were rendered available towards supplying the fecundated ova laid in the hatching troughs.'

The hatching troughs referred to were those in the private establishment inaugurated by the late Mr. Wilmot, in which he carried on for some years fish culture before the Dominion government took up the work, when the buildings were transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and fish-breeding has been carried on there until the present time. No doubt this special effort on the part of a private individual, gave that individual, in the eyes of some people, the right to confer his own name upon them; but the principle is one which has no claim to approval on general grounds, and there is on scientific grounds every reason for strongly condemning it. The name *Salmo Wilmoti* is one, therefore, which could not by any means be justified or gain currency. That vigorous and enthusiastic fish authority, the late Fred Mather, expressed himself thus clearly on this application of personal names to fish. 'I find frequent reference,' he wrote, 'to German trout, and I wish to protest against the use of that name for the brown trout. . . . the United States Fish Commissioner has seen fit to ignore the name brown trout, which, as the original importer, I have the right to give, and has called it "Von Behr trout," a name that will never stick.' The right claimed by the importer of a foreign fish, here urged, may be questioned; but it is certain that so long as the name Von Behr trout is used by fishery authorities on this western continent, their brethren in other lands will not know to what fish they refer. Certainly the name will never be recognized or adopted in any other country on the face of the earth. Quite a number of fishery experts have felt the inappropriateness which the selection of an unknown name for a well known fish possesses, and the hindrance it is to clearness and intelligibility, and Mr. A. N. Cheney thus strongly places himself on record in a recent issue of *Forest and Stream*:

'For years I have inveighed against the use of the term German brown trout, because it was absolutely improper. As well call our native brook trout New York brook trout or Connecticut brook trout, because they happened to come from either of the states named. Over and over I have written that the brown trout is the common brook trout of Europe. In Germany it is called brook trout and in Great Britain it is called brown trout. We cannot adopt the translation of the German common name, as we have a brook trout of our own, but we can call it by its English common name, brown trout, the trout of Izaak Walton, and the first brown trout eggs that ever came to this country came from England, though the first eggs that came here to a State or national hatchery came from Germany, and the name German brown trout has stuck to the fish in one of the State hatcheries ever since. The State of New York made a fish exhibit at the State Fair in Syracuse, and when I reached the building where the fish were and read over one of the tanks, "German Brown Trout," I felt I was wounded in the house of my friends, as well as stabbed in my vitals. It required but two seconds to pull down the cards bearing this misinformation, and it required at least five minutes talk to the man who prepared the cards and put them over the tanks, and the tail end of the talk was that such an offence should be deemed just cause for the dismissal of the offender from the service of the State.'

The same authority just quoted added great force to his argument, if any additional force were needed, in the considerations which he urged in a communication to the *New York Sun* when he pointed out that the fish in question is the common brook trout of Europe—Izaak Walton's trout, native to the waters of Great Britain and the Continent, introduced into the United States, New Zealand, South Africa, India, &c. In Ger-