

so that politicians opposed to the present Administration have in many counties played as their strongest card : enforcement of fishery restrictions ; oppression of the poor lobster and mackerel fishermen, who should have the right to put up traps where they please ! There is, judging by the attacks made on the Government for the enforcement of the Act, an entire change taking place in the condition of affairs. But to come back to scientific opinion, I may refer to Willis Bond, chairman of the Severn Fishery Board, who, in a paper read at a sanitary conference at Worcester on standards of purity for effluents from sewage works, said : " Salmon avoid filthy waters at expense of forsaking birthplace." Many hon. gentlemen have been taught to believe, and I always was so taught, that it was almost impossible to prevent salmon from overcoming any obstruction except an impassable dam to return to the place of their nativity. But on enquiry it is found that salmon will even overcome their strong natural inclination and disposition when the waters are made filthy. Certainly the La Have River has been made filthy. It is not unfair for me to refer to the *Morning Chronicle*, which informs me on these questions, and which I read with very great delight ; when on one sheet I find I am the subject of an attack for attempting to prevent mill rubbish being cast into La Have River, and then I find on another page an account of how an excursion party from Halifax had visited that river, and on disturbing the sawdust were made as sick as if they had attempted to cross the Bay of Fundy or the English Channel. I may, therefore, be pardoned for saying that the products of sawdust do tend to make the rivers, which were formerly splendid salmon streams, filthy and to change their character as fishing rivers. One man, and one man only, so far as I am aware, who has been connected in any official capacity with this matter in the Province of Nova Scotia, is on record as saying that the fish are not injured by sawdust. He is the gentleman to whom I alluded on a previous occasion when I spoke, and his name is Mr. Rogers. But I find that gentleman is on record time and again with a contrary opinion. In 1869, page 81 of his report referring to Cumberland County, he says : " Mill rubbish and sawdust have nearly depopulated both rivers and coasts, and but little business is done in fishing." It is to overcome that state of affairs that the department has been recently directing its attention to the condition of the fisheries, although there is much still remaining for improvement in connection with keeping the rivers pure and in a better condition than that described in 1869. That gentleman is also on record in 1878 ; but I will not weary the House with his observations. I refer to them only as showing that any opinion given since he has been attacking the department, and all the officials connected with it, from the head down to the most insignificant member of the staff, should be carefully considered and weighed before any further attention is given to it. We find in 1875 under the good Liberal régime that some hon. gentlemen would like to see renewed, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the father of this legislation, stated in answer to a question asked in the House : " It was part of the duty of the officers of the Fisheries Department to enforce the Sawdust Act and the Government intend to enforce it more rigidly in future."

Mr. TUPPER.

The then inspector for Nova Scotia reported that he had given formal notice of a strict enforcement of the law. It is a matter for regret that, from that day to this, there has not been a more vigilant, determined and conscientious enforcement of the law. Thus we have all the authorities, Wilmot, Venning, Duvar, Fortin, Veith and Witcher, concurring in their testimony and agreeing with the testimony of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and with the opinions quoted by me, given by experts in other countries. There have been, I say, many enquiries. There was the enquiry by a special commissioner in this country. There was the enquiry under Order in Council in 1871, when a vast amount of information was collected. There was the inquiry in 1877, with a similar result. There was the enquiry and formal report in 1874. There was the enquiry in 1888, in the Senate. I desire to refer hon. members to the report of the Fisheries Department, 1890, Appendix No. 5, pages 79, 80, 81, where the methods of disposing of sawdust are pointed out, and where mill-owners who wish to make an effort to save their sawdust, can ascertain the means of doing so. In a prize essay on " Salmon Disease, its Cause and Prevention," submitted at a gathering in connection with the International Fisheries Convention in London, at which the eminent men of all countries in Europe read papers and discussed these different questions, it is stated at page 71 : " If the sawdust from a saw-mill, or the chaff from a flour-mill, are permitted to add however little to these suspended particles, the irritation is no longer discomfort but frequently death." I will not further trespass on the good nature of the House, already shown in permitting me to go so uninterruptedly through these various points to which I have been obliged to refer. I will merely state to the House that as far as having formed any obstinate opinion upon this subject, I found the law as it is, I have studied all the opinions upon which I can lay my hands, from the time the duty was imposed on me of carrying out this law to the present, and I would be exceedingly glad to find that there was a solution of this question which would satisfy all parties, the manufacturers, the fishermen and the public. But the result of the authorities to which I have directed attention leads me to the conclusion, as I have more than once stated in regard to this question of the La Have, as well as other rivers, that the only charge that can be laid at the door of this department, in my own time, as well as at the time of my predecessors from the passing of the Act down to the present day, and for the special reasons to which I drew attention, is, that the Act has not been enforced sufficiently rigidly, and mill-owners have been induced to believe that by this influence or that, by their influence as carrying on the richest and largest industry, and their influence with this Government and other Governments, they might hope by agitation and obstruction to have that law changed. I have not seen any evidence on the part of this Parliament, or on the part of any other Parliament in which I have sat, of a disposition to change that law ; and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that before the policy can be attacked, legislation should be promoted and supported in this House, with the object of repealing that Act and wiping it from the Statute-book. I would not have travelled into the merits of the question on a motion of this