

this question was under discussion in the session of 1889. It was then very fully discussed, and on that occasion, as on the present, I am happy to say that the debate did not assume a partisan shape. The question was then discussed, as it has been to-night, very largely on its merits. I came to the conclusion in listening very carefully to all the arguments which were advanced on previous occasions when the sawdust question was under discussion in this House, that sawdust is injurious to fish life. I was surprised to hear from the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) this evening, that a correspondent of his, a sportman, in the Province of Nova Scotia, writing of a river on which there is a natural fish-way, had actually stated that sawdust had increased the quantity of salmon on that river. Such a statement I must now say—

Mr. FLINT. I do not think he went so far as that. I think he says that salmon had increased, although there was sawdust in the river.

Mr. KENNY. I quite recognize that the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), did not endorse the statement of his correspondent, and I think from the general tenor of his remarks that he admitted himself that the contention which has been made by the Minister of Marine, that sawdust is injurious to fish life, commends itself to his judgment; but I understood from him in quoting the statement of his correspondent, that this gentleman stated to him that the presence of sawdust had increased the quantity of salmon in that river. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) must remember that as regards this particular river to which he refers, he himself admits there was a natural fish-way whereby the salmon could pass up to the spawning grounds, and that consequently the spawning grounds were not destroyed by the presence of sawdust, and therefore I can readily understand that salmon still frequent that river. But as the anglers of Nova Scotia have been referred to, I must say that I have discussed the question with gentlemen who fish in our rivers regularly every season, and there is a general consensus of opinion among them that sawdust is injurious to fish life. The hon. member for Yarmouth has expressed the opinion that sawdust *per se* is not injurious to fish life, but that the injury is done by edgings, bark, and so forth, and that these are the injurious substances. I will agree with the hon. member to this extent, that as regards the obstruction of the navigation, these deposits of bark and edgings are infinitely more injurious than sawdust: but I must repeat, with all due respect to him, that from what I have heard in this House, from the discussions I have had with practical men on the subject, and from information gathered from my reading, I am forced to the conclusion that sawdust is injurious to fish life. We all know, even those among us who are perhaps the least informed on this question, that where the waters of a river are habitually and constantly polluted, the fish, salmon particularly, will avoid those waters, and hence it is that in most of the rivers where sawdust is deposited the salmon fishing has very perceptibly declined. Reference has been made to the Medway River, and to the effect that lumber mills are now operated on the river. I think there is only one mill, but I am not very positive, the one worked by Messrs. Davisons—

Mr. FORBES. It is not operated.

Mr. KENNY.

Mr. KENNY. I was under the impression that they were carrying on operations on the Medway River. I am quite prepared to admit that under certain conditions the depositing of sawdust may be harmless in a river, but the conditions are very exceptional. I refer to a stream which is a short one, where the mill is actually at the head of the tidal waters, where there is a rapid current, and a certain configuration of the banks of the river, where the banks rise abruptly and where the river is deep; in such a locality the depositing of sawdust where it is immediately carried into the ocean is comparatively harmless. I do not for a moment say that the depositing of sawdust in the La Have has been any obstruction to navigation. Speaking from the information I have gathered from others, because I cannot profess to have any personal knowledge on the subject, I am rather of the opinion that so far the depositing of sawdust has not been very injurious to the navigation of the La Have; I do not think it has been a very serious obstruction to the navigation of that river. I must say, knowing Messrs. Davisons as I do, that they are men of great enterprise and great energy, who have developed the lumbering business of Nova Scotia with perhaps more zeal than any other firm in the province, that I felt very great sympathy with them when they were unable to carry on their business on the La Have River. The Minister of Marine in the concluding portion of his remarks—I was sorry I had not the pleasure of hearing all his remarks—referred to the enquiries held in 1871, 1877 and 1884 to ascertain the means for removing sawdust. I may say here to the Minister, that in my conversation on the subject with the Messrs. Davisons, those gentlemen intimated to me that they were quite willing to construct any apparatus which would effectually destroy the sawdust, but that they had not been able to ascertain of their own knowledge any plan whereby that could be effectually done on the La Have River. I took the liberty on a former occasion when addressing the hon. Minister on this question, the matter then being one relating to another river in our province, to say that if some officers of the Fisheries Department would visit the rivers in some of the northern states of the union, where the fisheries are now preserved and where the sawdust is not allowed to be deposited in the rivers, and if the plan of the apparatus which prevents the sawdust passing into the rivers from those mills was communicated to our mill-owners throughout the Dominion, because this is not a Nova Scotia question by any means, then they would have a plan which might be adapted to their own lumbering operations.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman evidently was not in the House when I explained that the officers of my department had already explained how to save the sawdust. It is not necessary to go to the United States to ascertain how this is to be done, because in the various provinces of the Dominion, not only in Ontario, but in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, this is being done; and Messrs. Davisons themselves are saving their sawdust. The plans for this purpose are given in the last annual report of my department; I gave the pages of the report to the House, as I did not wish to weary hon. members with the particulars. As regards saving the sawdust on the La Have River,