

## Marine and Fisheries.

VICTORIA, B.C., 5th March, 1892.

### *Afternoon Session.*

The Commission was convened at 2 p.m.

Present: Mr. S. Wilmot, in the Chair; Commissioners Armstrong and Higgins, and Mr. Secretary Winter.

MR. ASHDOWNE GREEN, who had been recalled, appeared, and was asked by the Chairman if he had been sworn when giving his evidence yesterday.

MR. GREEN.—Oh, yes; I was sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. And it was said that you were not sworn in the usual way, and that it was intentional?—A. Nothing of the sort, sir; I was duly sworn.

Q. And do you find that the Chairman had put words in your mouth to say?—A. No; but I will say that it struck me that sometimes you gave me a history of the Canadian salmon, and you took up those points that resembled the British Columbia salmon, and, of course, I could say nothing, except that it was so.

Q. But was it not correct?—A. Oh, yes; but you did not take up those we think do not agree.

Q. Well, I will take them up now.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. I understand you know something about the Skeena River, Mr. Green?—A. Yes; I was up there last year. I went from the mouth to one of its principal sources.

Q. Does it fork at Hazelton?—A. I was also up the larger fork.

Q. Were salmon running when you were up river?—A. Yes; there were five species running. I did not follow them up. I left one kind running up at the Forks and got into another kind when I arrived at the lakes. I was at the Forks when the humpbacks was running, but they had not arrived at Babine when I got there, and I was curious to know if they were running so high from the sea.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Well, may I interrupt the witness—it may be said again that he was not sworn. Will you please take the book?—A. Yes, sir.

MR. GREEN was thereupon duly sworn.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. What is the distance of Babine Lake from the coast?—A. I can hardly tell you; about 160 to 180 miles. It is a very large lake, and it is full of salmon, according to the Indians; well, the salmon go there; that is all that go by that fork. I did not see the humpback, though the Indians tell me they go there.

Q. Do they go beyond that?—A. No; that is the limit of the lake; it is a source, you may say.

Q. Are there any small tributaries?—A. Oh, numbers. I did not visit any tributaries of the Babine. I was principally employed at the mouth of Babine, and I was thinking there must be immense quantities of salmon taken there; the Indians have traps in all directions.

Q. You say you saw five species; can you enumerate them?—A. Certainly. There is spring salmon, the sockeye, the coho, the humpback; the coho and humpback I am not certain about, but I think the coho goes in. The dog-salmon and steel-head I also observed, particularly because about here it is an early fish, and enters in January and December, but there it does not enter until August generally.

Q. How many canneries are on the Skeena?—A. I did not count them; I think six or eight.

MR. ARMSTRONG.—I think in the evidence it is given at eight.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. Is there any complaint of scarcity of salmon there?—A. No evidence at all of it.  
Q. Were you there at the spawning season?—A. Yes.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. When was that?—A. The end of September.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. Was there any evidence of fish having died?—A. Yes; a good number.

Q. And were they still running when you left?—A. Yes, they were still running. I did not see any spring salmon; their habits are so different; they are not likely to die; the ones I saw were particularly sockeyes and cohoes.

Q. With regard to the difference in salmon in the east and these, what do you think?—A. The only one bearing any resemblance is the spring salmon: that is the only one.

Q. And yet the salmon in England it resembles is a red salmon?—A. The only difference, as I said yesterday, is that I do not think the smolts are the same, and nothing is ever found in other salmon.

Q. Have you ever tried the fly here?—A. Yes; but always for the cohoes; not for spring salmon. I never caught an adult salmon with the fly; but then I have never fished when it is in the river. I have caught adult salmon with phantom minnow; but I never tried the fly but a few times, and then caught grilse. The coho I have taken several times, and always at the head of tidal waters. I have been told they have been taken above tidal water. The cohoes are a perfect nuisance; they take your fly; I once took five. The fish I took were clean and bright, though not well developed. The adult ones would not take the fly.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. I shall not be wrong now, sir, if I say the character of salmon you are just describing are very similar to other salmon?—A. The spring salmon are; not the other salmon.

Q. You say you have caught grilse?—A. Yes; from five to seven pounds, I have caught them.

Q. Have you ever seen any but male salmon that were grilse?—A. These were male and female I caught.

Q. Would you catch any female grilse of four pounds weight?—A. I cannot remember. I think I caught one of seven pounds weight.

Q. Would not that be same as salmon on Atlantic coast?—A. Yes; very like.

Q. And is not the male one year in advance of the female in pro-creative work?—A. Yes; I know the male salmon is. I never saw any grilse of dog-salmon or cohoes. The spring salmon run according to their age, up to seventy or eighty pounds.

Q. The smolts only descend the river; they do not ascend?—A. No; I never knew of one to do so.

Q. And at what period do grilse first come in the river after coming down as smolts?—A. That I cannot say. I have taken grilse in April; that is the earliest.

Q. Do you know the accepted idea that prevails in Great Britain that grilse go up very soon after being a smolt?—A. Yes; I know that in some cases it is very short. Some smolts may go down in the fall and up in the spring as grilse.

Q. Then are not the character of grilse and spring salmon in Cowichan River, very like the English salmon?—A. Yes; they are very much alike.

Q. They come in the months of April, May, and June in eastern provinces, and then spawn and go back again?—A. Yes. Here they come in December and January.

Q. Yes; that is on account of their being so much winter?—A. Yes; probably.

Q. And you think spring salmon will take the fly at the proper time—when would that be?—A. In January, February, and March, I should say.

Q. When they come in first, they will take the fly readily?—A. Oh, no; not in Skeena. They will in Cowichan. The water in the Skeena is too muddy. There are some half dozen rivers in British Columbia where you can catch them with the fly.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. Then another river like the Cowichan, running into the sea, would give angling sport, if practiced?—A. Yes. The Nanimo River is another. It is a practice there to go fishing for cohoes. It has been for nine or ten years—I mean with the fly.

Q. I think, sir, as far as my knowledge goes, your statements are identical with what you made yesterday?—A. Yes; I don't see any difference.

Q. Illustrating more strongly, perhaps, that the spring salmon is quite like the other salmon in the eastern provinces?—A. Yes; except the coho salmon. It resembles grilse very much, but afterwards get more of a larger species.

Q. Do you think coho a separate species of the salmon family with spring salmon?—A. No; many things are alike, but his flesh is drier and his bones and vertebrae are different—his fins, etc.

Q. Would it not be because he is slighter and smaller?—A. They vary much in different rivers.

Q. Then spring salmon is red when it comes in, but afterwards gets white in flesh, and enters in April, May, and June?—A. Earlier in the Cowichan River; in January.

Q. And the coho?—A. In June, but the coho is much whiter than the others.

Q. Yes, but they change like the spring salmon?—A. Yes, they do.

Q. The reason of asking these questions, Mr. Green, is simply to find out information—you know in England much wealth is made out of the rivers leased for angling and in eastern Canada the same way, but here—have you any rivers where this can be done, because if so, you have another source of wealth which it would be advantageous to foster?—A. Yes, but I hope you will not tax me for having found it out.

---

GEORGE VIENNA, a native of Greece, residing in British Columbia since 1858, a fisherman for 28 years, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Where do you fish when you are at home—up the arm?—A. No, outside—not in the arm at all.

Q. What do you fish with—small seines?—A. Nets of one and one-half inch mesh.

Q. What do you catch?—A. Herrings, flounders, smelt, big salmon.

Q. Do you catch a great many?—A. Sometimes.

Q. How long ago is it since you gave up going out to fish?—A. Twenty-three years and I have been keeping store since.

Q. Do you find fish getting scarce?—A. Sometimes, but if they get scarce we change places.

Q. Are there plenty of fish now?—A. Well, if they are caught every day the fish get scarce.

Q. You think there is too much fishing?—A. Well, there are too many people fishing.

Q. Do you get any fish from Puget Sound?—A. Oh, sometimes—the oulachon principally.

Q. Small flounders?—A. No, only oulachons.

Q. Do you buy any fish that are caught up the arm or in Esquimalt Harbour?—A. No, we get them from Saanich and Cowichan sometimes.

Q. I wish you would show him the sizes of the mesh, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Wilnot proceeded to show the witness the diagram on file showing the different relative sizes of meshes.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Well, which of those sizes do you use?—A. I think we use all kinds of mesh here.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Do you ever use smaller than a half inch?—A. Yes, for shrimps.

Q. What size do you use in your nets mostly?—A. We use herring nets mostly—we use all kinds except the half-inch—sometimes we use it, but only for shrimps.

Q. What do you get in one and a quarter?—A. Oh, small kinds.

Q. Herring and smelt?—A. No, not at all.

Q. What kind of mesh have you in bag of the seine?—A. Oh, about one and a quarter in back side.

Q. Point out which it will be?—A. Well, sir; I cannot tell from that (the diagram)—if you show me the nets I will tell you.

Q. Did you ever get fish from the arm years ago?—A. Yes, I used to fish myself up the arm—up as far as the second bridge.

Q. Have you ever been in Esquimalt Harbour?—A. Oh, yes: we used to draw nets through the harbour—but now we cannot fish—there are too many lines.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. How do you know the fishing is reduced, from the fish you used to catch to what you catch now?—A. Well, we used to have 25 boats, but now we have only a few.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Do fishermen catch any young salmon in the nets now?—A. Yes; of course if they find them they catch them.

Mr. BEAUMONT BOGGS, a native of Nova Scotia, 7 years in British Columbia, a broker, and resident of Victoria, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. What have you to submit to us, sir?—A. I reside on the shore of Victoria Arm. I take pleasure in trout fishing and since my residence in Victoria have fished in Victoria Arm. Some three years ago, in April, 1887, I complained to Capt. Lewis, the Dominion officer, of the fact that nets were spread across the mouth of the Arm above Point Evert's Bridge; these nets prevented the trout, in my opinion, from reaching the upper portion of the Arm which is the fishing ground. Upon one occasion on my coming down in the morning in a canoe, I saw some Italian fishermen drawing their nets, and I examined the fish that were in their nets, and among the number were quite a number of trout, I should say about half a pound, also flat fish, smelt, herrings, etc. The practice of netting still goes on during the night on Victoria Arm. Only two months ago I dispersed two pair of fishermen below my house engaged in spreading their nets. I was informed there was no officer here who could look after them, as the fish inspector was at Westminster.

Q. How long ago was that?—A. Three or four months ago, I think.

Q. Before you had any local officer here?—A. Yes. I believe it would add a great attraction to our Arm if trout were put in there from the hatcheries and protected for a certain time and netting prohibited altogether.

Q. Is this Arm saline water?—A. No; not altogether. Two small streams run in.

Q. The sources of these streams are pure?—A. Yes.

Q. Gravelly bottom?—A. Yes; in some portions.

Q. Are you acquainted with streams in Nova Scotia?—A. Yes.

Q. Do these resemble them?—A. No; I think not. The water is, I think, salty. I think the bottom in our eastern rivers has more vegetable matter; that is not muddy, but more leaves, etc.

Q. Small aquatic plants growing in them?—A. Well, here there are some of them, too.

Q. Would it be better if this stream was deprived of aquatic plants?—A. Well, I don't know.

Q. Do you think these streams are adapted for the breeding of trout and that netting is diminishing them?—A. Yes.



## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. Are you acquainted with the different appearances of young salmon and the small trout?—A. No; I cannot say I am. I could not say one was young salmon or trout.

Q. Then some may have been young salmon instead of trout?—A. They may be.

Q. And you think this netting should be prohibited?—A. Yes. I think it is not exactly the number of fish that are taken as the number of fish that are killed. I have seen myself near my house great numbers of young fish floating belly up dead.

Q. Do you know what caused their death?—A. No; it was during the days when these fishermen were netting.

Q. It has been said that these fishermen draw their nets ashore and leave them there to die?—A. Well, I believe that is done.

Q. If you throw fish on shore is it likely to come alive?—A. No.

Q. And the number of fish thrown ashore become refuse and offal?—A. Yes.

Q. As an angler have you fished outside of this Arm?—A. I have fished on Sim's River running into Alberni Canal, and on Cowichan River.

Q. What fish did you catch on Cowichan River?—A. I cannot say I caught very much; my luck was not very good.

Q. You got "water-hauls"?—A. I am afraid they were "water-hauls." I have seen good salmon caught there with the rod and fly.

Q. In what season would that be?—A. I think in April or May. It is some years ago.

Q. Then you are aware that salmon are caught in British Columbia with the fly?—A. Yes.

Q. (Jocularly) And then that Englishman who said it was a bad country because they could not be caught with a fly made a mistake?—A. Yes; the Sims (Esmos or similar name) running into Alberni Canal is really a fine angling river.

Q. And then from an angling stand-point do you think trout should be protected in these rivers; some say they should be killed off, because they are destructive to salmon fry?—A. Well, that is from a commercial stand-point. I think a large number of persons, wealthy persons, visit this province for the object of sport, and if it was known all the fish and game of this province were exterminated they would seek some other point.

Q. And if protected and encouraged it would add to the wealth and prosperity of the country?—A. I think so.

Q. Are you aware that there are fishery laws for the preservation of trout in other countries?—A. Yes; there is here, too, but there has been no one to see it, was carried out.

Mr. WILMOT.—Have the other commissioners anything further to ask?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—No; nothing further.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well; thank you, sir.

---

ALEXANDER BEGG, a native of Scotland, four years in British Columbia, and forty or fifty years in other parts of Canada, at present a resident of Victoria, and engaged in looking after colonization projects, in particular that of the Scotch Crofters.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Are you, Mr. Begg, identified with the Crofter immigration?—A. I believe I am.

Q. Well, have you anything to state to this Commission on the subjects under consideration?—A. I have not had much experience myself in connection with salmon fishing, because during the salmon fishing time I have been across in the old country looking after the project engaged in. I only know there are a great many kinds of salmon put up, and know there must be a great deal of offal come from those salmon, and I have examined the offal that came from the fish, as it was understood that a change was to be made in that regard. I also looked into the manufacture of dog-fish oil on the west coast, where that has been carried on for many years. I visited the oil refinery or factory on Alberni Canal, and saw how the oil was manufactured there from dog-fish, and also visited the Skiddegate oil factory on Queen Charlotte Island, and also

on the Queen Charlotte Islands visited the seal oil factory on Comishaw Inlet. These are the principal oil factories we have, but they are principally for dog-fish oil, and the refuse matter or solid matter belonging to that oil is thrown away entirely; it is not utilized. As soon as the oil is extracted by steam it is floated up in cold water; the oil is very effectively extracted in that way, but leaves the residue in a sort of gruel, and so far it has been found impossible to solidify that product, and so it is thrown away; they open a valve into the sea and let it away, so that is quite lost as far as we are concerned. While I was examining that matter, I wanted to find out the different constituent matters in fish that might be utilized for making oil and fish guano, if that could be done, so I procured samples of the different kinds of fish. One was dog-fish, and I put it into a can or vessel; I also got part of a cod-fish, such as would remain after cleaning cod-fish for market; I put that into another can marked; I also got some salmon, and put heads and tails and entrails in the parcel; I also got some herring, and had four samples, and brought them to Ottawa to have them analyzed, to see if we could work them to advantage. The dog-fish, of course, we knew about here. When I brought them to Ottawa I found, rather to my disappointment, the great Experimental Farm there would not look at them; they didn't think they had time to look at them, and they asked me to take them away. Well, as I did not want to lose my time altogether, I thought I would try the small provincial affair, and I went to the Agricultural Department at Toronto, and called upon the Minister of Agriculture, and he said very kindly that he would enquire from his Professor of Chemistry, and he sent them on, so shortly afterwards, I got a report from Professor James, the chemist. It seems to be very fully gone into, and gives everything very fully. (Hands in document.)

Q. Is this the same as appeared in the *Colonist* the other day? (See pp. 112 and 113.)—A. Yes; the same thing, only it is more fully shown in that paper. I thought it a very good report, but have not been able to do anything further since. Still, it is very evident from that report that Professor James is a very able man, and gave it a good deal of attention, and I have no doubt his views are pretty nearly correct; at the same time, I do not think we have the machinery to separate the solid matter from the fluid.

Q. Have you formed any opinion of your own aside from this report?—A. I believe it can be done, but the machinery to do this will take very expensive machinery, and it may be that another way of extracting the oil from what is done here may be used. At present we float the oil out by the introduction of water, but there may be some other way that will be better and more easily worked, but it is found at present that the oil from dog-fish, when cool, gets into a kind of jelly, and so far, it has not been worked profitably, and I have no doubt those who work it on the Fraser River have found it to be correct.

Q. Have you ever made estimates of what would be required to put up an establishment for this purpose?—A. No; I have not got an estimate, but I think it would be more expensive than estimated—though they do manufacture this oil from fish offal in Norway, where they have been for many years in that business, and I suppose we could get from them some information as to how it is managed.

Q. Do you know if it has been sufficiently satisfactory to be remunerative?—A. Oh, yes; they have been carrying it on for years, and unless remunerative, they would not do it. It was also tried at Aberdeen, and they made all sorts of essences, etc., etc., but they had to give it up, because they could not get the supplies. Now, the same thing would apply to the Fraser River, because, except during the fishing time, there would be no supply to carry on the work—the fishing only commences in June and July, and as soon as the fishing is over, of course, the offal is done. Now, it is different on the west coast, where we have dog-fish and other fish, etc., and we would expect in this scheme of colonization that the fishing would be going on all the year, and it would be quite different to the Fraser River.

Q. What about the fishing that is carried on after the sockeye run? Could not these fish be utilized?—A. Oh, yes; that was my intention in connection with this colonization scheme—all kinds would be utilized. If oil fish, they would be used for oil; and if food fishes, they would be used for that purpose. There would be no waste, whereas in salmon fishing, it is only the choicest parts that are put up in cans, and, of course, that makes it more difficult.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. Have you ever seen reports as to the Aberdeen establishment?—A. I have seen reports, but I cannot say as to them. The great difficulty of that Aberdeen establishment was that they could not get supplied to keep going; then the machinery was expensive, etc., but it is not so up north. Up in Queen Charlotte Islands oil factories are still going on there, and they use all kinds of fish to make fertilizer, that they cannot use for anything else. I think it can be carried on, and in connection with this colonization scheme, with which I am connected, we have a separate company which will look after the fish altogether—take them off the fishermen's hands, and see to the marketing of them, and they will most likely after that part of it, see about the oil, etc.

Q. What inducements are you holding out to immigrants coming here?—A. They will have plenty of fishing and work to do, and will be paid for their work, and that is all a good industrious man requires. We also have made arrangements for advancing money to bring them out and establish themselves.

Q. Have you spoke of the salmon fisheries?—A. No, we have been careful to avoid any interference with existing interests—the object of this scheme is to establish new industries and we do not wish to interfere at all with the salmon industry.

Q. What special manufactures do you anticipate?—A. Well, one of the special ones was this oil refining, and then anything that comes in the way will be used, if not for food for something else. Then another point will be to preserve table fish by cold storage.

Q. Then you did hold out inducements that this was a large fishing country?—A. I told them there was plenty of fish and that they would have work in catching them—and then the markets would have to be found, and that is the object of this company that has been formed—to find these markets.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Do you know with expensive machinery you speak of that it can be carried on successfully—that is the oil business?—A. I think so—the oil—that pays.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Do you say the oil pays?—A. Certainly it does—it pays the man at Serrat (?) and it pays at Clough on Alberni Canal, only that they cannot get supplies—the trouble is the Indians will not work steady—they go picking (?) and other things, where as our fishermen could stay at the business and have work all the year round.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Do you think the oil made from offal from canneries would pay?—A. I do not know if oil from salmon would pay alone, but I have no doubt that with proper machinery it would pay from salmon offal, but on account of the short season it would not pay on account of not being able to get supplies.

Q. Well, from what they speak of humpback fish—I think you should get plenty of oil from them?—A. Well, I don't know if they are fat enough or if there is any oil in them.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Well, while you were away getting this analysis made, did you enquire where you were likely to have a market for this manure?—A. Yes, I did—and I believe there are parties who would be willing to take large quantities if they could get it at prices paid for ordinary manure.

Q. Was that in England?—A. In the United States too, and even in Canada we find the lands are running out a good deal and require manure. I think that was the object Professor James had, because he thought it would be useful for the Dominion. It is a manure of very fine texture and would be easily absorbed by the plant.

Q. With a view to encourage Crofter immigration and provide for people coming here as a result of that scheme you would naturally look into the cost of delivery, etc. of this oil and manure and could you figure out a profit after deducting cost of transport, etc.?—A. It is said the value in Ontario is \$34 a ton, and that is a price on the basis of what it will bring.

Q. But what would it cost to get it there?—A. Well, that is the price after all that I fancy.

Q. Is not \$30 a ton the most paid for manure like that?—A. Yes, about that.

Q. And would you have to send it across on the Canadian Pacific Railway?—A. Yes, I suppose so.

Q. And the freight would be about \$45 a ton—more than it would sell for?—A. Well, I don't know—I think if the canneries thought of going into it, the canneries would no doubt be willing to assist in getting the offal and delivering it in scows at place of manufacture.

Q. What did you find the freight would be on the Canadian Pacific Railway?—A. Oh, well; I did not go that far—I made a certain allowance for freight, and so much for labour, etc.

Q. But I think it would be necessary before counting in these things to find out what it would cost to produce and what it would cost to get to market?—A. Well, that would have to be added to the cost of production.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But you would only get about \$30 a ton in Ontario for it.

Mr. WILMOT.—But is it a fact that it costs \$45 a ton to take freight down?

By Mr. Higgins:

Q. Not every thing; steel rails are the lowest; \$18 a ton, and then you would have to run a second train of *eau-de-cologne* to take the smell out of the country. (Laughter)—A. Oh, it would be deodorized before it was shipped. I have been at three factories—at Skiddegate, at Clough and Burrard Inlet, and there is not so much stench from them. I don't know what the one is like on the Fraser River.

Q. Do you know there were such factories in California, but they never paid, and that every fertilizer establishment on the Fraser River has always failed?—A. Well, I don't know. I know these establishments at Skiddegate and other places I have mentioned have made money.

By Mr. Armstrong:

Q. How many Crofters do you expect to bring out?—A. Well, we at first thought 1,500 families, but that would not do on account of the cost to bring them here, and we have got the sanction of the Government to reduce the number to 1,000 and that would give £150 to each family. We do not intend to interfere with any residents, Chinamen or others.

By Mr. Higgins:

Q. Have you ever sent communications to the Department of Fisheries at Ottawa in regard to the manufacture of this offal?—A. Yes; I believe I did so.

Q. Did they do any thing?—A. No; they were very careful not to go into it themselves. I think as far as the residue is concerned, when the oil is taken out and properly steamed, it does not seem to be so very offensive; the great trouble about the odour is that fish are allowed to stay too long before being steamed. I think after the steaming process commences it takes away the offensiveness.

Q. The offensiveness is then created in the cannery?—A. I don't know, but if fish are allowed to stay even a short time, it soon commences to foment and putrify; that is the reason I want to get them taken away in the same day.

Q. Do you know of any market for this oil in British Columbia?—A. Well, they sell the dog-fish oil very freely here for many purposes. The salmon oil, I should think, would be a very digestible oil; the Indians eat the salmon oil; the other from dog-fish cannot be eaten. The salmon oil could be used for leather making. It is not so very offensive and can be deodorized. When I was in London, I found there was a place where all the dead horses were collected and they were used up in all manner of ways. The flesh is used for cat-meat and the bones are taken in a retort, and they make oil out of it, and after it is clarified and refined, you could not tell it from olive oil, and I think the salmon oil would be very fine.

Q. Did you ever offer to put any capital into the business, Mr. Begg?—A. Yes; I did so once.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. Did you ever apply for a bonus from the Dominion Government?—A. Well, I thought it was necessary for us to have a bonus; it was also proposed that cannerymen should help in working it.

Q. What did the Dominion Government reply to your request?—A. Oh, they didn't do anything. They are not likely to do much on anything of that kind.

Q. And you never enquired what freight would be on the Canadian Pacific Railway?—A. No, I did not. I do think there would be a fair field in the south for the manure for tobacco raising, etc. I think \$10 a ton was the price to be given and with my figures, I think there would be no reason for it not succeeding if the cannerymen would help in the matter.

Q. Have you ever eaten Limburger or blown butter?—A. I do not know, perhaps I have.

Q. Do you think this fish oil could be used for other purposes?—A. Well, I do not know, perhaps it could; it could be rectified; I remember in that place where the oil from bones of horses was made that it came out as clear as could be.

Q. Did you taste it?—A. No; I did not.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. You know coal oil is very offensive in its crude state?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know that by deodorizing and cleansing it can be made into the finest articles on the market?—A. I do, sir.

Q. And you think, if properly treated, a good article could be made from those fish?—A. Yes, I do; I think the oil can be clarified; and especially the oulachon would make an excellent oil.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. I do not suppose, Mr. Begg, if you were in the cannery business you would feel that you were treated rightly if the Government or any other power compelled you to convert that offal into oil or something else, at a loss?—A. Well, I don't know; I don't suppose the Government will insist upon them producing oil and guano from them. I understand all they insist upon is that it shall not be thrown into the rivers; I am not aware that they insist upon it being converted into oil or guano.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. As you have been asked if you were a canner, now, if you were a farmer, what would you do?—A. I would certainly complain about them.

Mr. WILMOT.—That will off-set the other.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Well, I will give you another; if, as is supposed, Mr. Begg, you lived along a slough which was almost stagnant and where all the refuse from kitchens and closets were thrown in, would you drink that water and expect to enjoy good health, even with the addition of a little whiskey?—A. No, I would not, even with a little whiskey in it, but I understand the Fraser River is a large stream and has a rapid current and all stuff like that would be carried off.

Q. No, sir; I am talking of a sluggish slough almost stagnant, and I am asking you a question, if, after drinking that water, would you wonder at people getting typhoid fever?—A. No, I would not.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. But if before the canneries were put there and no offal was thrown in?—A. I should think the offal would help it.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But suppose before these canneries were there, there were no inhabitants to suffer from it and even then the water was stagnant and undrinkable.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, well, never mind; with the offal it has got worse; before it was not so bad I suppose; let us get on with business.

Mr. BEGG.—I have nothing further to submit to the Commission.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I wish Mr. Ladner to be called.

Mr. WILMOT.—I would draw the attention of the Commission to the fact that Mr. Ladner has been up two or three times. (To the Commissioners)—What do you say, gentlemen?

Mr. WARD (from audience).—I would say, Mr. Chairman, that you stated last night that if any gentleman had anything further to say you would hear him. I thought of matters after giving mine that I would like to give at further length.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, if we hear you, Mr. Ward, why we will have to allow every one to come again, and we are not going to stay here day after day to hear the same story repeated over and over.

Mr. WARD.—It is very apparent then, Mr. Chairman, that it is not intended to make this enquiry exhaustive. We certainly expected that the Commission, when here, would be willing to get all information of value. Now, I know myself I have thought of matters since giving my evidence the other day which I would like to state to the Commissioners, but if you don't want to hear it, why all right; but—I think—

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this. Mr. Ladner has been heard before, and I think we should not go on allowing every one to come up as often as they want to, and go over the same story.

Mr. WARD.—You don't want a full enquiry, it is obvious; you don't want to hear all matters.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, you were here on the stand. Why could you not put matters in then? We allowed you to put in papers and anything you like.

Mr. WARD.—Yet I do think after a witness has been examined, I think if more evidence occurs to him, and it may be very important, I think it should be taken again. Now what are we to infer? We come here day after day, and we hear other men giving their evidence, and questions which may not have been put to us lead us to a line of thought on certain points, etc.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, there is no use making a speech about it. I must call you, sir, to order. The rule was established that we would not hear witnesses repeatedly. Mr. Ladner has already been up two or three times. If Mr. Ladner is allowed to come here, Mr. Ward will come again.

Mr. WARD.—I don't want to, sir. I would not come. I can well understand the Chairman would not want to hear me again.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, perhaps I would not be in the mind to let you do so.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, I have a word to say. That rule was broken this afternoon. I think I should have a word to say. Mr. Green was called this afternoon. I offer Mr. Ladner as an important witness on important matter. If important evidence can be obtained from a witness what does it matter if he is called half a dozen times. I certainly say that we should hear Mr. Ladner.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, but Mr. Higgins, you know we cannot go on hearing everybody that comes along. The fishermen in Westminster didn't ask for this.

Mr. WILMOT.—I think we should keep to the rule. Mr. Ladner has already been heard two or three times, and if we hear him again we will only have to go over the whole thing with most of the other witnesses here.

Well, I put it to the Board; what do you say, gentlemen, shall Mr. Ladner be re-heard?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I say no.

Mr. WILMOT.—I say no.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I say yes.

Mr. HIGGINS.—That will do, Mr. Ladner, the Commission refuses to hear you.

Mr. WARD.—Gentlemen, let me say that you re-called Mr. Ewen half a dozen times and Mr. Port two or three times in New Westminster, and I consider this is disgraceful; your actions in conducting this inquiry are shameful.

Mr. WILMOT.—Order, sir; I call you to order.

Mr. WARD (contemptuously).—Oh, yes; I will keep order.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Let me tell you, Mr. Ward, you are not running this Commission.

Mr. WARD (excitedly).—No; I don't want to. I shall not bother you. I tell you publicly, you are acting disgracefully. However, we are done with you for good; for I know, I for one, shall not attend your meetings again.

## Marine and Fisheries.

(Mr. Ward, accompanied, by some others, here left the room. Remarks were inaudible, owing to more or less noise, and several persons speaking at the same time.)

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I move that this Commission adjourn altogether.

Mr. WILMOT. Shall we adjourn—meeting again on Monday morning—if these gentlemen have any new evidence to give?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—No witnesses over again. If you have any new witnesses, we will hear them, but not the same persons over again.

Mr. J. H. TODD.—But, gentlemen, is it really your intention to forbid any person supplementing his evidence in any way, if this Commission continues sitting?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, but Mr. Todd, how long will this go on? You never saw such a thing allowed in any court in the country.

Mr. TODD.—Well, I have been present in a good many courts where counsel has re-called the same witness to give fresh evidence on the same case.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, just give me an instance.

Mr. TODD.—I cannot cite an instance off-hand, but I will bet you \$100 that it is often done.

Mr. WILMOT.—This is not a betting community, sir. Well, gentlemen, shall we adjourn until Monday morning or not? What do you say?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; till Monday morning.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, but are there any new witnesses? I was prepared to finish up here to-day, and adjourn from here to Nanaimo, or elsewhere.

Mr. WILMOT.—Then I suggest that we adjourn till Monday morning, if we have new evidence.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, Mr. Chairman, I have new evidence from Mr. Ladner, but if he cannot come, I will call another witness. I will telegraph for him, if necessary, and have him down.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, that is all right.

Mr. HIGGINS.—It is not all right. It is all wrong. You are both acting in a harsh, arbitrary manner, and I am very sorry that I accepted a seat at this board, after the way I have seen matters conducted here. You are both acting altogether wrong.

The Chairman declared the Commission adjourned at 3.45 p.m., until 10 a.m., on Monday, 7th March, 1892, at the same place.

BOARD OF TRADE ROOMS,  
VICTORIA, B.C., 7th March, 1892.

### *Morning Session.*

The Commission was convened and called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Present: Mr. S. Wilmot, in the Chair; Commissioners Higgins and Armstrong, and Mr. Secretary Winter.

Mr. WILMOT.—Before any business is transacted, I wish, gentlemen, to read to you the following statement:—

“Mr. Wilmot begs to submit for the consideration of his associate Commissioners of this Royal Fishery Commission, appointed to investigate matters in relation to the salmon and other fisheries of British Columbia, the following, viz.:

“That this Commission having been formed by the Dominion Government for the purposes above mentioned, but more particularly as regards the salmon fisheries on the Fraser River, where almost the whole of the complaints have originated which brought about the appointment of the Commission, and as the sittings of the Commission have been openly held there in the court house and town hall during ten days, in which some fifty or sixty witnesses, comprising cannerymen, fishermen, and others, were heard in relation to the above mentioned complaints; and as the Commission adjourned to the city of Victoria to obtain further information, and has had four days sittings in the room occupied by the Board of Trade, and has taken evidence from cannerymen, their agents and brokers, fishermen and others, and as no further new evidence is forthcoming, it is expedient in

the interests of the British Columbia Fishing Industry that this Commission should now adjourn to meet at Nanaimo on Wednesday next, unless found necessary to extend the time; and that this Commission then adjourn to the city of Vancouver (or Nanaimo) most suitable to Mr. Higgins in his official capacity as Speaker, for Friday and Saturday, from thence an adjournment to New Westminster to wind up the business of the Commission with the view to making an early report to the Government, so that the Department of Fisheries may be enabled to alter or amend the present regulations to conserve the general interests of the cannerymen, fishermen, and others of the public, for the protection of the fishing industry of the province of British Columbia. It is understood that whichever place of adjournment (to Nanaimo or Vancouver), shall be made upon the days mentioned as most convenient to Mr. Higgins, and that telegraphic despatches be sent at once giving notice of the meetings."

Mr. WILMOT (continuing).—I put that forth as explanatory of our programme of business. I submit this for your consideration.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Let it lie over Mr. Wilmot for a few minutes. I would ask that the Secretary read over his notes of Saturday's evidence in regard to the discussion upon the question of re-hearing Mr. Ladner.

The SECRETARY.—I would say, sir, in explanation before reading from my notes that much of the discussion in reference to Mr. Ladner was very animated and from the fact of the tendency for several persons to speak at once and the more or less confusion resulting therefrom, as well as the fact that much was not evidence direct; some person's remarks may be found wanting in my report.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I wish it read as you have it in your notes; that part referring to Mr. Ladner.

The Secretary thereupon read over the portion of Saturday's evidence referring to the question of hearing Mr. Ladner.

Mr. WILMOT.—Are the Minutes correct?

Mr. HIGGINS.—I have no fault to find with them. (Continuing). I labour under a disadvantage, as you are aware, to hear this evidence of this Commission. I wrote the department to say that I could not leave Victoria until 15th April, to sit on this Commission, and was obliged to let several of the sittings go by default; of course, it will be considered that the majority of the Commission were present, but I was obliged to let many of them lapse. I may say I have not heard Mr. Ladner's evidence yet, and he is here under his own expense in the city and he has new evidence to give. Now, I put it to you, gentlemen, that I want to hear this evidence. I cannot give a verdict upon the report without the evidence from Mr. Ladner. I have thought over it and I think the Commission should yield this point to me, and so I can form an opinion.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I may state for your information that I have instructed the Stenographer to get up as many pages as can be given you to-day and I think Mr. Ladner's and others will be included in them.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes, but I want to hear Mr. Ladner's new evidence, and I know in courts of law it is often the case.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—But Mr. Ladner has been called three times.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but still even if called three or four times what matter—he has new evidence and I wish to hear it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I quite agree with you, Mr. Higgins, but I don't see how we can come to a satisfactory conclusion before we arrive at any conclusion.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But, I do not see how we can come to any conclusion without the evidence!

Mr. WILMOT.—No, of course we cannot arrive at a conclusion without it.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but here is Mr. Ladner's evidence—that we would not have. I will pledge my word to Mr. Wilmot and you (to Mr. Armstrong) that I will not ask Mr. Ladner any but new questions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Now Mr. Higgins, you do not know where this will end—if we allow Mr. Ladner to come we will have to allow many others. Now, it is not the rule in a court—I have known cases where counsel has had privilege of re-calling witnesses, but he must state his question, and it is optional whether the judge will allow it or not.



## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But this is a public enquiry—there is no third party. But I will say, call Mr. Ladner, and no other man will be called.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, I object to it. These people knew perfectly well this Commission was going to be held—they have known it in Victoria for two weeks, and they have not attended to their business if they don't know.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But, Mr. Ladner is a river man.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, he has been here three or four times.

Mr. WILMOT.—I find, Mr. Higgins, your statement is perfectly correct and that you wrote the department on the 21st January that you could not leave Victoria to sit on the Commission until 15th April, owing to your duties in the Legislative Assembly. The Minister was away from home at the time and I telegraphed him, and I want to show that there is no attempt to do anything out of reason in connection with the fisheries of this province—I state this so the province will not take a wrong view of the actual case. Now, I find from this file of papers, containing the whole record of the case, that on 26th January, this message was sent to Lt.-Col. Prior and T. Earle, M.P.'s.

"Would be greatly obliged if you would let me know if new Commissioners are ready to act at once, if they are, Mr. Wilmot will go to British Columbia without delay—if not, it will be necessary to cancel commission as far as this season is concerned.

(Signed) CHARLES H. TUPPER.

And in reply to this, the following answer was received:—

"Victoria, 27th January—New Commissioners ready to act—cannot you send one from department who is unbiassed—Wilmot's opinion already formed.

(Sd.) THOS. EARLE, E. G. PRIOR.

To this the Minister replied from Halifax, 29th January:—

"Answer Earle and Prior in my name, and say Mr. Wilmot is in my opinion the most competent officer in the department, and on no condition would I name another for the purpose.

(Sd.) CHARLES H. TUPPER.

Mr. WILMOT (continuing).—I wish to be particular and precise, because there seems to be very strong feelings here, and I wish if there is any doubt in the matter, it should rest in the right place and not in the wrong one. Then, after receipt of Mr. Higgins's letter, stating he could not sit until after the 15th April, unless the meetings were held in Victoria, I telegraphed the Minister as follows:—

"2nd February.—Higgins writes required as Speaker in Victoria till 15th April. If Commissioners sit there can attend meetings. Information sent you to avoid possible complications. Shall I proceed at once?" Oh, previous to this, I find on the 30th January, messages were sent to both Mr. Armstrong at New Westminster and Mr. Higgins at Victoria:—

"Will leave here to meet the Commission early next week.

(Sd.) "S. WILMOT."

Then on the 2nd February, in reply to my message of the same day, the Minister wired me as follows:—

"Proceed British Columbia and hasten proceedings of Commission.

"CHARLES H. TUPPER."

On the journey over from Ottawa, of course, I telegraphed to Mr. Armstrong, at Westminster, being the first place at which the cars would stop:—

"Have you made any arrangements for meeting at Westminster or Victoria?" And the answer was: "Call at Westminster," and I did so. I then tried to make arrangements where we could organize, and I ran back and forward two or three times between Westminster and Victoria to get the Commissioners together, and at last succeeded, and Mr. Higgins came to Westminster on Thursday morning, 19th February, and we proceeded to work Friday and Saturday, from 10 a.m., to 10 p.m. Mr. Higgins

was anxious to get along as much as possible and so were we. Mr. Higgins had then to come to Victoria to attend to Parliamentary business; there was no objection to proceeding with the business.

Mr. HIGGINS.—None whatever.

Mr. WILMOT.—We then proceeded with the business all the following week and then came over here. We have been here four days, and at times it has been difficult to get witnesses together. Then Mr. Ladner was asked to give further evidence. We made a rule at the beginning to not hear a witness a second time, and I think the matter has been carried on very fairly all the way through; but an impression seems to have prevailed among many of the canners that the chairman has been too self interested in putting questions to witnesses—

Mr. RITHEP.—No, sir; no, no.

Mr. WILMOT.—Pardon me, sir; I am addressing the Board.

Mr. RITHEP.—Yes; but we are going to deny anything not correct that we hear.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I submit this paper embodying my views as to the further carrying on of the business (referring to statement handed in and read at opening of day's proceedings). Now, in this case of Mr. Ladner's, unless exceptionally new matter

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, we are very much obliged to you, Mr. Chairman, for your very true history of the carrying on of the business; but you have avoided the real matter at issue. Mr. Ladner's evidence is very important, and I do not think you are treating me right in not hearing this evidence. Why should I be deprived of hearing this witness? I cannot make up my mind as quick as you gentlemen.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Thank you, sir, thank you.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I really cannot see why you cannot allow me to hear him.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, I have no doubt that if this evidence is heard in Westminster, there would be a great many people there, too, who would wish to come forward, and then I do not think it would throw any particular light upon this matter.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I must say, if I had sufficient spirit, which every one knows I have not, I would retire from this Board at once. You will not hear my witness. Then the Commission is sitting at the wrong time of the year altogether. I have been unable to hear much of the evidence, being obliged by my other duties to be absent.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, excuse me. We cannot go on hearing the same persons over and over again, and if we allow one, we will have to allow many. Besides, Mr. Ladner has been heard several times already.

Mr. WILMOT.—One matter I must correct, and that is this: on behalf of the Government who were instrumental in forming this Commission, at the request of all the members of Parliament of British Columbia, you should not make remarks that it is the wrong time for the Commission to sit. This thing has been urged for some three or four years, and I think this is the third set of Commissioners who have been appointed but who would not act, and then after appointment, the Minister wired Messrs. Earle and Prior, M.P.'s for Victoria: "Would be greatly obliged if you would let me know if new Commissioners ready to act." Now, what was the reply to that? Messrs. Earle and Prior stated: "Fishery Commissioners ready to act." Thereupon, the Minister telegraphed Mr. Wilmot to proceed at once. Now, if they were not ready, or anything was in the way of the Commission going on to business, why could they not telegraph and tell us. And I think that everything has been done that could have been done in the matter.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I have no complaint to make, and although I think the Government has done everything they could, but here I am not allowed to hear my witness.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, we are here as public persons, Mr. Higgins, and not as private persons.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, I think if Mr. Ladner wanted to give evidence, he could have given it in New Westminster.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, will you hear him in New Westminster?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—We will consider it if he comes up there.

Mr. WILMOT.—If Mr. Ladner asks to be heard at Westminster, and if a majority of the Board says he will be heard, he will be received.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh, fie, Mr. Wilmot, I enter my protest against these proceedings. I will have it out at Ottawa, if I have to go there and pay my own expenses. An unjust proceeding, that I am not to be on the same footing as you other gentlemen.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—It was your own fault, sir; why could you not have attended the sessions?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, you know very well my other duties have prevented me.

Mr. WILMOT.—I think none of you gentlemen have any complaint to make of me. I have always been on hand.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, have you any witnesses?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I call Mr. Ladner. If you object to it, I want it to go on the Minutes. Is Mr. Ladner's evidence objected to?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Objected to.

Mr. WILMOT.—Objected to.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Very well, Mr. Ladner, it is declined to hear you.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, now about this matter which I have laid before you, I thought it should be before all the Board. Now, in regard to our adjournment to Nanaimo or Vancouver, as far as I am concerned, it will be made to suit the convenience of Mr. Higgins, either on Friday or Saturday. We have heard that evidence will be forthcoming at those places.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I am willing to leave it to Mr. Higgins's convenience.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I think I can be at Nanaimo on Saturday.

Mr. WILMOT.—But my proposition was that we adjourn to-day to commence at Nanaimo on Wednesday; therefore, if we adjourn to-day to meet either at Nanaimo or Vancouver at your convenience, we will send telegraphic despatches to these places that the Commission will commence at a certain time at these points.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but I cannot be there.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, but cannot you say if you will be at Nanaimo or Vancouver on Friday or Saturday?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—But if Mr. Wilmot is to have sittings at both places this week, I think Nanaimo is the most important place and I would prefer we all met there.

Mr. HIGGINS.—On Saturday?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes, on Saturday. I think there is more fishing round Nanaimo than Vancouver.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, gentlemen, I am at your disposal. If you think it is necessary to wait until Friday or Saturday, all right. I would also like to suggest to my brother Commissioners that it will be important for the Commission to get down the Fraser River and see these localities we have heard of; I think we should do so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes, I think we should go there.

Mr. HIGGINS (jocularly).—Well, in consideration of Mr. Armstrong's toe, I think we should go where he says.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—But is it not possible, Mr. Higgins, you could make it convenient to come and go down the river with us.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I could go on Sunday.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I object to that decidedly; we cannot go on public business on Sunday.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh, then we will take a chaplain. (Laughter.)

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, gentlemen, now where will we say. Which will you prefer, Nanaimo or Vancouver?

Mr. HIGGINS.—I cannot be there on Wednesday; well, I raise no question; set your own time and place; I can be at one place on either Friday or Saturday.

Mr. WILMOT.—I think it will be most important for the Commission to sit at Nanaimo or Vancouver. There are important sea fisheries there, but if you do not think it advisable to go there, why say so. I am perfectly well aware that cannerymen and others are looking forward anxiously to the report from the Commission, and I think we should expedite business.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I think I will go to Vancouver.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, then we shall record that the Commission will adjourn to-day to meet at Nanaimo on Wednesday and then adjourn to Vancouver at 1 p.m., on Friday.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I think Mr. Higgins should come to Nanaimo.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I prefer to go to Vancouver.

Mr. WILMOT.—And that telegraphic despatches be sent to the papers at Nanaimo and Vancouver giving notice to that effect.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—It would be important to insert in the notice where we should meet at those places.

Mr. WILMOT.—Can any gentleman give us any information about these places where we could meet?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Could you not say Saturday at Vancouver?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I make this proposition—that we meet at Vancouver at 1 p.m. on Friday and take such evidence as will offer, but that the evidence will be read over to Mr. Higgins the following day.

Mr. RITHET.—I wish to be called to give evidence on a point on which I did not give evidence the other day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—We have not settled this point yet.

Mr. RITHET.—Oh, I thought you had.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I think we should meet Saturday at 10 a.m., at Vancouver, and Nanaimo at 10 a.m., Wednesday.

Mr. RITHET.—I repeat my question to be heard upon a point upon which I was not questioned when I gave evidence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—It is the same question.

Mr. RITHET.—Oh, no; it is quite a different matter—I would not ask the Commission to be put on the stand on the same question, but it is upon a matter which was not put to me which was put to others—it is but one point.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh, no; if we hear you we will have to hear others.

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes, if the rule is once broken there can be no deviations from it, and as Mr. Armstrong has stated the other day, if any one has anything to say let him put it in writing—but it has been decided that no one can be heard twice.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I think if Mr. Rithet has evidence he should be heard.

Mr. WILMOT.—If Mr. Rithet has anything to give us let him put it in writing.

Mr. RITHET.—But I want to give this under oath as other evidence has been given.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh, well; you can put it in writing and then make an affidavit under oath before a magistrate. (Continuing—perusing evidence given at Westminster). Now here it has been stated that no one was called the second time, and here is the evidence that at Westminster, Mr. Port was called a second time and heard.

Mr. WILMOT.—Exactly, but the majority of the Board consented to it—in the present case the majority of the Board do not consent to it.

Mr. RITHET.—Well, but if you are not going to hear me, can you be surprised that we have such opinions of this Commission?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, Mr. Rithet, when any man comes forward to give evidence we ask him his name, etc., and then he is asked if he has any matters to state to us.

Mr. RITHET.—Yes, I remember that, but this point has arisen to me subsequent to my giving my evidence—I was not cross-questioned on this point, and I heard it given by other parties, and it was not given as intended to be given.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, but how can you give a statement under oath to contradict another man's evidence?

Mr. HIGGINS.—What? Why Port has done this in Westminster.

Mr. RITHET.—I am going to give my statement from figures. My application is noted both by the press and the stenographer for the commission—I have done my duty—I will have further to say about it later.

Mr. WILMOT.—We regret very much sir, to say that we must adhere to the majority wishes of the Commission.

Mr. RITHET.—My application is declined—am I to understand it to that effect?

Mr. WILMOT.—Your application is declined.

Mr. RITHET.—(sarcastically). Thank you, sir.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I wish it inserted in the minutes that I vote for everybody being heard.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I fear if we allowed these persons to be heard they would incriminate each other.

Mr. WILMOT.—If the question arose among some ignorant fishermen or persons not conversant with the rules of public order, but here are gentlemen versed in matters connected with the conduct of public business, and if we heard all persons repeatedly, why it would take all summer.

Mr. RITHET.—But I am in order, sir. I come to speak on facts.

Mr. WILMOT.—And it is equally advisable for the authority to say they shall not be heard.

Mr. HIGGINS.—How would it do for us to adjourn and take legal advice upon the matter?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, but we could call in all the legal men in the city, and would you have them discussing these matters?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; have everybody who could give us information.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, that perhaps would be all right. I know they would not agree. (Laughter.)

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, is there any further evidence?

Mr. J. H. TOPP.—I wish to be permitted to put in this paper as evidence, the 5th annual report of the State Board of Fish Commissioners to the Governor of Oregon, published by authority, 1891. (See pp. 10 and 11.)

---

MATTHEW JOHNSTON, a native of Scotland, 28 years in British Columbia, a resident of Victoria, and manager of the British Columbia Canning Company, was duly sworn.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, sir?—A. I would like to say something on the question of the impression as to profits made by canners. I have seen it told that the profits are something enormous; but having been connected with canneries since 1876, I am in a position to say that is a wrong impression. It is a very fluctuating business; some years fair profits are made, and other years no profits are made, and in the years 1884 and 1885, the losses were so heavy, and the business in such a bad state that many canneries suspended—some went to the wall altogether, and never resumed operations. We have now to compete with Alaska, where fish is packed cheaper than we can pack, and it is only by keeping up our reputation that we can make any profits at all. Last year, I venture to say, the canners will not make any profit, or if any, extremely small, and this year the prospects are not much better. I saw it stated that \$5,000 would equip a cannery or build a cannery. That is utterly wrong. I think if it was stated \$25,000, as about an average, it would be nearer the mark. Then, besides the actual capital invested in the canneries, the plant and buildings, etc., one must be provided with working capital, which is a very large sum, and I think that statement about \$5,000 altogether wrong. That is all I have to say on the subject of the impression which I see abroad.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, you see the statement in that case was a mistake; you see another man was altogether wrong.—A. Well, it was not a mistake; that is another way of putting it.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Anything further, sir?—A. Not on that subject. I have something further to say on the subject of licenses. Last year, as I understand, the regulations that the department intended to enforce was fair enough: that is, that each cannery should have a certain number of boats. That in principle seems right enough, but a number of buildings, not canneries, obtained licenses also, and those licenses were really used for other canneries altogether. I thought that was an injustice to us at the time, and protested to the department.

Q. You protested at the time?—A. I protested to the Fisheries Inspector at New Westminster, and I believe the department did not intend that those licenses should be issued.

Q. You say you think the department did not intend these licenses to be issued for these new canneries!—A. No; I do not think it did.

Q. Could you give your reasons, Mr. Johnston!—A. Well, I had a telegram from Mr. Earle on the subject, which I can get if necessary.

Q. Oh, no; your word is sufficient.—A. It is a telegram in which he stated that only those canneries in operation should have licenses, but they were not observed. I think if the principle was observed of giving each cannery in actual operation a certain number of licenses—twenty-five we hope to get—and only give those licenses to canners actually engaged in business, I think the canners would be satisfied. As to fishermen, I think that if suggestions already made that those licenses should be given only to actual fishermen, and one for each boat, made not transferable, but the license fee to be equal, that we would find that system would work without injury to any one.

Q. Then I understand, Mr. Johnston, that you complain that additional licenses were granted for a number that you were supposed to obtain, to other parties, merely for the purpose of getting licenses!—A. I do not say for mere purpose of getting licenses, but they were not running. At the time I made this complaint, they were not in operation.

Q. The object was then to get the double number!—A. They were put up anyway.

Q. I remember, Mr. Johnston, hearing that licenses had been given to persons who had simply put up a cannery for the view of getting a double set of licenses—that was one of the views in Ottawa, but I don't know.—A. I was going to say that another year they adopted the principle of issuing licenses according to the capacity of canneries, but I think we were able to convince the department that was a wrong principle, and, as far as we were concerned, they gave way and increased our licenses. Of course, if capacity was to be taken, we were ready to increase our capacity to any on the river, and we claim rights on the river because we were established as soon, if not before any other cannery. I may say I represent five canneries in the province.

Q. Could you give the names, if convenient!—A. I represent canneries both on the Fraser River and northern rivers. Of course, I am not an expert, and I do not think I need submit my views on the offal question, except that I know our canneries do not hurt any one by depositing it in the river.

Q. The reason I asked the names—A. Oh, the names. On the Fraser River, "Deeside;" on Rivers Inlet, one is known as "Rivers Inlet Cannery" and "Victoria Cannery," and we have a fishery there as well known as the "Standard" (?) or "Windsor" (?) fishery; on the Skeena, we have the "Aberdeen," and on the Naas River, we have a cannery known as the "Naas River."

Q. What is the name on the Skeena!—A. The Windsor Cannery.

Q. The new cannery!—A. No; it has been in operation; it is situated farthest up.

Q. How many licenses do you get for that cannery!—A. Twenty-two, I think. We had an equal number with others.

Q. I think other parties stated about forty!

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Is Mr. Dempster manager up there! I think we have his figures!—A. Yes he is manager of that cannery.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Are seines used in any of these rivers!—A. No; only gill-nets.

Q. Seining is not carried on!—No.

Q. Your statement is that you hope to get twenty-five licenses. Do you consider that is sufficient to run your establishment!—A. No; we would require to get outside boats beyond that.

Q. Do I understand you that you would throw open to the river the building of as many canneries as people might desire, or do you wish to exclude others from building there beyond what is now built!—A. Well, if it lay with me, I would exclude more canneries.

Q. Well, sir, that is an important matter which has come before the department and this Commission. It has been represented that if new ones were built it would

## Marine and Fisheries.

effect trade generally and commerce. Well, now, if twenty-five would be all you ask for, and there were forty canneries built instead of twenty-two, how would that affect you?—A. I imagine it would be a case of the "survival of the fittest."

Q. Well, you can readily understand it has been a difficult matter for the authorities to decide. Persons contend that they should be allowed to build as many as they like.

*By Mr. Armstrong :*

Q. Do you think all canneries on the Fraser River should have the same number of licenses?—A. I think so ; that is, we should not have less than any other cannery.

*By Mr. Wilnot :*

Q. And how about the others?—A. Well, we want to be on the same footing as others.

Q. You want twenty-five boats, and licenses should be given to fishermen who are British subjects?—A. Yes.

Q. And if all these licenses were issued, it would make a great number, and if fishermen got all, would it not affect the river?—A. I think there should be a certain number.

Q. What number would you say?—A. I think if the regulation was maintained as to distance where nets are put in the river, you could limit the boats that could fish on the river.

Q. Could you limit the boats to certain distances when fish are coming in?—A. Well, there are regulations to that effect.

Q. Yes ; but when a large run of fish is coming in, you could understand it would be very hard to keep the boats apart, and thus it is necessary to make a certain number—500 or 600. Would that be sufficient to protect the river?—A. Well, as I have stated before, I think the licenses—so many given to each cannery, and fees made equal, and other restrictions, will prevent there being too many boats, and would be sufficient to protect the fishing interests of the river.

Q. You are not desirous of going into the offal question?—A. No.

Q. But I might ask what are your views on the effect of throwing in this offal on fish or the human family?—A. Well, as regards the human family, I think if I was a resident at certain parts, I should not care to be a resident, but in other parts, I think it should not effect.

Q. How does it affect the town of Delta?—A. Well, our offal does not reach there.

Q. But we are speaking of offal generally?—A. Well, I am not prepared to give an answer as regards the Delta.

Q. Well, if your cannery was situated there?—A. I would like to have an opportunity of observing first, before I answer that question.

Q. Have you formed any views as regards the correctness of the close season?—A. I have not formed any views. Our managers have expressed themselves satisfied with the present regulations as it seems to work very well.

Q. It has been represented that it is unfair that part of the Sunday should be allowed for carrying on fishing. Many fishermen have respect for Sunday as a day of rest, etc., while there is fishing on that day ; many think it should terminate at 12 o'clock?—A. Well, I can only express the general view of our fishermen, namely, that the present regulation is found to work well.

Q. You think the licenses should be non-transferable?—A. I think not.

Q. And the fees also should be alike?—A. Yes ; for the Fraser River, fishermen and cannery alike.

Q. Well, as regards the Skeena and Naas River?—A. I think the present rule should govern, but if hatcheries are put up, I would be different. Now, at Rivers Inlet one might be put up.

Q. Oh, I forgot to ask you that question. What do you think of the effect of hatcheries?—A. I am not able to give an opinion on that subject.

Q. But what do the most of the fishermen and others think. You, as an experienced man, and having a good deal to do with the fisheries, could you not tell us?—A. Well, the general opinion is that it cannot do any harm and may do a good deal of good, but I do not think we are in a position yet to give any decided opinion upon it.

Q. But you would like one at Rivers Inlet!—A. I think it might be considered. It might not be found a good place for one, but I think the question of hatcheries for the northern rivers should be considered.

Q. Can you tell us the average catch of your canneries! What was the number of fish taken in the cannery to make your output!—A. I am sorry to say my knowledge of that is not sufficient to enable me to give any correct answer.

Q. But could you not say from information you have from your workmen!—A. Well, I have heard, I think, it takes about 10 or 12 fish to a case; but I could get this information, as we record in our books the catch of each boat, and that book is at the disposal of the Commission if they require it.

Q. It would be well if you could transcribe from that book the average number for the last few years; the object of the Commission is to get all information possible upon this question; I have noticed that many think the object of the department is to curtail as much as possible the working of this great industry, but it is quite incorrect; the department does not desire to curtail at all this great industry. Have you anything more to say, Mr. Johnston, on any of the leading questions!—A. No; I have nothing further to say.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Have you had any experience in establishing an oilery or establishment for taking care of this offal!—A. We contributed offal from our cannery for two years, but we had no interest in the factory beyond putting \$50 in it for the privilege of being allowed to give them our offal.

Q. Do you know the result of that oilery!—A. I have no personal knowledge, but I have heard it was not a success.

Q. How long ago was that!—A. I heard it last year, but I did not think they intended doing it again. We paid them \$50 for receiving it and delivered it.

Q. Did they make fish manure out of it!—A. No; I think they only made some oil.

Q. Can you give amount of capital invested in canneries on the Fraser River particularly!—A. Well, it is information I should not like to give an answer off-hand.

Q. When could you give it—later on in the day!—A. I think so.

Q. Would that be admissible, Mr. Chairman!

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, if he wishes to give this in writing.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I would prefer it being given in evidence. I think it would be inconsistent with our practice to have it sworn to. We can adjourn now, and Mr. Johnston can come back again.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Will it answer your purpose, sir, to come again!—A. Any time, sir, it answers your purpose, I shall be glad to come in.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Only that I cannot be here to hear you.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, but if he gave it in writing, would it not do!

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; I presume it would. What I require also, Mr. Johnston—I would require the amount given for rolling capital—to keep matters going.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, if he gives other canneries, it will require cross-examination. It might require investigation on account of other canneries.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but never mind the expenses of other canneries—we want the amount of capital invested. I ask him his opinion of the value of capital invested on the Fraser River.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, then, if he only gives an opinion, it will come in as information only.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but that is what we want to get at.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Have you anything further to say—Would you prefer to put it in writing or appear before the board!—A. Just whatever suits you, sir.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Very well; put it in writing.—A. Very well; it will be put in.



## Marine and Fisheries.

FRANCIS PAGE, a native of Scotland, in British Columbia since 1862, a merchant, and resident of Victoria, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilnot :*

Q. Have you anything to submit to this Commission?—A. Well, I wish to submit the annual inventory of one of the canneries on the Fraser River, in which I am interested, with amount of stock we carry over, amount of plant, etc.

Q. What cannery is that, sir?—A. The "Wellington" is one and the "Delta" also.

Q. Both on the Fraser River?—Yes; one at the mouth of Canoe Pass, and the other at Colithuan Slough.

Q. You are interested as proprietor, are you?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, if you have any suggestion to make?—A. I would merely wish to show the amount of money invested in a cannery, buildings and plant, and stock carried over and steam-boat.

Q. Would you call a steam-boat as part of the plant?—A. Well, no; but it is part of the whole. I would give buildings and machinery and material carried over.

Q. What do you mean by material carried over?—A. Well, the material we could not use during the season.

Q. Not the actual goods carried over?—A. Oh, no.

Q. Well, now, value of buildings and machinery?—A. Buildings, \$14,965; machinery, \$9,530; material for making cans, etc., \$14,098; office furniture, \$232; mess house, \$67; steamer, \$3,000; total, \$41,892. The land we valued at \$150 an acre, but to-day it is worth \$500 for the purposes we use it.

*By Mr. Armstrong :*

Q. How much land have you got?—A. Fifteen acres.

Q. Oh, but you do not require that much land for a cannery?—A. Well, most of it is required; the land is needed for Indians' houses, etc.

Q. How much for the "Delta" cannery?—A. Five acres.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. What is the total of that?—A. \$41,892, and that is all capital lying idle.

*By Mr. Wilnot :*

Q. How do you mean lying idle?—A. Well, we have to carry it over for next season.

Q. Can you tell us how many cans of fish you sold last year?—A. I cannot tell you, sir, but I could find it out from our agent.

Q. If I tell you, sir, cannot I come pretty nearly correct?—A. I don't know.

Q. You say the "Wellington" is one?—A. Yes, and the "Delta."

Q. Now, cannot you give us an idea; there were 12,870 cases recorded as coming out of the "Delta" the year before last; has value of property increased since 1890 to 1891?—A. I think it has increased.

Q. Well, what was value in 1890?—A. Well, this money is what the cannery cost us.

Q. Do you say this is invested here or invested last year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And you say land is increasing?—A. This is an inventory of the property.

Q. Precisely, and you say it was worth so much in 1891; now, what was it worth in 1890?—A. We have not valued it at any more than we did a year ago.

Q. Well, what was your invoice a year ago?—A. I have not got it here; the land of course increased; the values are the same; the buildings, etc.

Q. Well, we will let that drop; can you tell us the value of the stock, the canned salmon, as made at "Wellington" cannery?—A. Well, that is a very hard thing to say; it depends how much you pay for your fish.

Q. Yes; but if persons keep such an accurate account they would surely give figures of pack?

Mr. RITHEI (from audience).—Now, this just shows the folly of the working of the Commission. These matters are matters which I wished to bring to the notice of the Commission. Mr. Page is not familiar with them. I could have given you all information you wished and stood cross-examination, but you would not let me.

Mr. WILMOT.—Then, Mr. Page, you cannot give the value except from such papers as you have!

Mr. HIGGINS.—I think Mr. Page has answered these questions very satisfactorily.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Do you include the land in the forty-one thousand odd?—A. Certainly, the land is valued at cost; it is what we paid for it ten years ago; I have the inventory also of the "Delta" cannery.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Then it is capital invested.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, as I stated, Mr. Page, when you put in papers with figures you are liable to cross-examination, otherwise it would not show.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I think it is very good evidence.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Have you anything else?—A. I have an inventory of the "Delta" as well.

Q. And are you prepared to answer questions on it?—A. I have not had very much time to become familiar with the statement, but I daresay this is an inventory of the cannery and plant of the "Delta."

Q. What does "cannery and plant" mean, sir?—A. First of all there is the cannery buildings, \$9,000.

Q. And land also?—A. Yes; the land goes in with it.

Buildings and land.....

Steam boiler..... \$2,000

1,200

Q. The "cannery" means then simply the building, the shed?—A. Yes.

Q. Very well; go on!—A. 2 "Hagar" pumps, \$515; 1 injector and fittings, \$60; steam-fittings, pipes, etc., \$500; 14 kettles and odds for boiling fish in, \$420; jacking for steam pumps, \$40; 145 corders at \$5 apiece, \$725; 200 corders at \$4.50 apiece (for flat cans) \$900.

Q. How large are they in size?—A. I could not exactly tell you; they are quite three feet.

Q. How deep?—A. From two to four inches.

Q. And how wide apart?—A. Quite three feet. (continuing reading)

7 travellers.....

\$40

Q. Living or dead travellers? (Laughter).—A. They are living when you pull them with a rod. I saw one once fall on a Chinaman's head and be thought it was alive. (Laughter.)

Cooler covers.....

\$70

Q. Is that for keeping them from getting "swelled heads"?—A. Oh no. (Laughter.)

Q. Well, if you will put in the whole paper we will take them?—A. Why, yes, sir.

Mr. RITHEI.—But these papers are ours; we don't want to leave them with you.

Mr. WILMOT.—But if you put in these matters we must keep the evidence, I want to keep these facts.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But here is a recapitulation, would not that do? All these little matters do you not think they are necessary for a cannery?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, that is just it. I don't think all these things are necessary for running a cannery. Now let us bring this matter to an end; are you willing to put this in, if not, we will consider that you refuse to put these figures in.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Do you put that paper in as evidence?

(Witness demurs and pauses.)

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Give us the gross amount; I am satisfied with that?—A. \$26,346.46 for the "Delta" cannery.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. RITHET.—Less the——(remainder of sentence inaudible.)

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Mr. Rithet, this is our business, not yours.

Mr. PAGE.—The total amount is \$37,969.76.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Do you give us that paper as evidence or not?—A. I cannot part with this paper, sir.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. Now, what is the working capital required to carry on this cannery; have you any idea of that?—A. Well, I don't know exactly how much it costs to put up a case of salmon; some years it costs more than others; last year I guess it cost nearly \$4.

Q. Do you remember how many you put up last year?—A. About 12,000.

Q. In 1891 you put up 12,000?—A. Well, figures cannot lie if put in in evidence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, I insist in this, these papers being put in in evidence. In a court you must put in any papers you offer.

Mr. RITHET.—A court is a permanent institution, but this is different.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I tell you Mr. Rithet we have all the powers and authority of a Supreme Court.

Mr. WILMOT.—More than that we are a Royal Commission.

Mr. RITHET.—Oh, I know—I have been on a Royal Commission before now.

Mr. WILMOT.—Matters given here and submitted to the Government are supposed to assist the Government in regulating these important matters and any papers put in should be left with us.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. Well now, you say working capacity for 12,000 cases?—A. Yes, about that.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Have you taken that statement from the paper in your hands or not? A. I have taken them from this myself.

Q. Do you put that paper in as evidence?—A. No, I do not.

Q. If you are asked to put that in as evidence you say no?—A. I say no—it does not belong to me.

Q. Then you are giving your evidence upon another persons statement?—A. Yes.

Q. Very well, that is all I want to know. I now put it to the Board whether this evidence given by Mr. Page shall be taken as evidence, unless the paper is given?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I say it is not evidence at all.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I say it is most important evidence.

Mr. WILMOT.—I say it is not evidence at all for this Commission unless the paper is given to us.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well now, gentlemen, you refuse to put in this paper—we will give you a copy of it—how do we know it is genuine?

Mr. RITHET (indignantly).—It is genuine, sir.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Then you refuse to put in the paper?—A. Yes; I have said so before.

Q. Have you anything further to say, Mr. Page?—A. No.

Mr. J. H. TODD.—I wish to ask a question of privilege—it is in regard to the question put to Mr. Ashdowne Green, the other day, when asked if he had been sworn. I see this following report in the *Colonist* of yesterday:—

"Mr. Todd," said Mr. Wilmot, "represented to me that not only had you not been sworn, but furthermore that the omission on my part was intentional."

Mr. WILMOT.—I made that statement.

Mr. TODD.—Well, now I beg to differ from you entirely, and I think if you will re-call the circumstances of the case you will see that my contention is correct. Now, if you will recollect that when Mr. Lomas came to give his evidence, I whispered to you

that Mr. Lomas was being heard without being sworn—Mr. Lomas then turned to me and said "you don't believe me unless I am sworn?" I then said, I was quite ready to accept his word with or without his oath, but others might construe it differently, or words to that effect.

Mr. WILMOT.—But it is the same thing, Mr. Todd—what you said was the same thing—now, if Mr. Todd wishes to make an apology—

Mr. TODD.—You are entirely and totally wrong in making such a statement.

Mr. WILMOT.—As far as I am personally concerned, it does not matter.

Mr. TODD.—But it matters to me, and I say that the statement you made was a deliberate untruth—it was an untruth.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh yes: take it back Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILMOT.—No, sir; I won't take back what is untrue.

Mr. TODD (emphatically and striking the table with his fist).—It is an untruth, sir—I deny it emphatically.

Mr. RITHET.—Hear, hear.

Mr. WILMOT.—Mr. Secretary, you will take down the fact of this applause.

Mr. RITHET.—Yes, you can take my name too.

Mr. WILMOT.—(to Mr. Todd). And do you still mean to say, sir, that what is attributed to you in that paper is not true?

Mr. TODD.—Certainly I do—I appeal to anybody who was present yesterday and will ask them who is right in the matter.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, well never mind—we will adjourn now—to meet again here at 2.30 P.M.

The Commission adjourned at 1 p.m., to meet again at the same place at 2.30 p.m.

#### BOARD OF TRADE ROOMS,

VICTORIA, B.C., 7th March, 1892.

#### Afternoon Session.

The Commission met at 2.40 p.m.

Present: Commissioners Wilmot, in the Chair, and Armstrong, Mr. Secretary Winter.

On question by the Chair if any witnesses, and there being no response, the Commission was declared adjourned until 3 p.m.

At 3 p.m., the Commission was again called to order.

After an informal discussion by the Commissioners it was decided to permit Mr. M. Johnston to submit his statement by mail as he was not quite prepared to submit it at this sitting.

Mr. D. J. MUNN.—May I ask, Mr. Commissioners, if you intend taking evidence again at Westminster?

Mr. WILMOT.—I cannot say—if the matter is brought before us we may consider it, but I am not prepared to say we will or will not.

Mr. MUNN.—I would like to know, because I know of an important witness, and if he had a few days to look up matters, he would give very important evidence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Where does he reside?

Mr. MUNN.—At Westminster.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, we will be taking evidence at Vancouver on Saturday—we cannot say until we get back to Westminster.

Mr. MUNN.—Well, I was just thinking as he was a Westminster man, it would take off time in taking evidence at Vancouver.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, we don't know if there are any at all, or how many.

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes, and if Mr. Higgins can come with us and go down the river and see the location of these places of which we have heard.

Mr. MUNN.—I should like very much to get this man's evidence in—he is a new man, and it would be most important.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, if there is nothing else before the Board we will adjourn till 1 p.m., on Wednesday, at Nanaimo, and so that it could be made known, I would suggest we wire the papers at Nanaimo and Vancouver to put in advertisements, notifying the public of the meetings in those places. From Nanaimo the Commission will adjourn until 1.10 a.m., on Saturday, at Vancouver.

The Commission thereupon adjourned at 3.10 p.m., to meet in Nanaimo at 10 a.m., on 9th March, 1892.

The following written statements were received from Mr. M. J. Johnston, who gave the main portion of his evidence at Victoria, on 7th March—and were received as a portion or addition to such evidence.

"VICTORIA, B.C., 11th March, 1892.

"The Secretary,  
"The Fisheries Commission,  
Vancouver, B.C.

"SIR,—For the information of the Commissioners, I beg to state in reply to the question which was addressed to me, viz:—

"How many salmon were used for canning purposes and how many cases were packed with same at the Fraser River cannery—Deas' Island, last season?" "That 80,745 salmon (sockeyes) were supplied to the cannery, and were used in packing 7,137 cases of 48 one pound tins each—being an average of 11 $\frac{2}{3}$  fish per case. A tin, nominally one pound, contains more than a pound of fish—about 17 $\frac{1}{2}$  ounces as an average."

"I am, sir,

"Your obedient Servant,

"(Signed), MATTHEW J. JOHNSTON."

VICTORIA, B.C., 11th March, 1892.

"The Secretary,  
The Fisheries Commission,  
Vancouver, B.C.

"SIR,—I was requested to give an approximate estimate of the amount of capital invested in the canneries in operation on the Fraser River, and in reply to which, I beg to submit the following figures as my estimate:—

Average cost of land, buildings, machinery and plant.....	\$ 25,000
40 boats, complete with sails, etc., at \$40.....	2,000
60 nets complete, at \$150.....	9,000
Steam-boat and scows.....	4,000
	\$40,000

Capital required for a pack of 12,000 cases:—

Material, labour, freights, insurance, etc., at \$3.75 per case. \$ 45,000

An average of each cannery of..... \$85,000

Or for 22 canneries, \$1,870,000.....

(Signed), MATTHEW J. JOHNSTON.

NANAIMO, B.C., 9th March, 1892.

The Commission was convened in the City Hall at 3 o'clock p.m., according to previous arrangement.

Present:—Mr. S. Wilmot in the Chair, Mr. Sheriff Armstrong, Mr. Secretary Winter. Several persons being present.

Mr. WILMOT.—In calling this meeting to order, I may say, gentlemen, that the Dominion Government has upon the representations of the British Columbia members of Parliament appointed a commission, consisting of myself, Chairman, the Honourable Speaker Higgins and Mr. Sheriff Armstrong, of New Westminster. The more special object of the Commission was to obtain voluntary information on the whole question of the fisheries of the province either by statement offered or by questioning by the Commissioners—the sea fisheries as well as the river fisheries will come under the scope of the Commission—and we will be glad to hear about any fisheries in your neighbourhood. I may further state that this Commission being duly organized, etc., as a Royal Commission, we follow out the usual course followed in a court—all evidence will be taken under oath, and questions put and answered under oath. I cannot help but draw attention to the fact that we have been rather forestalled in coming here. I see by your *Free Press* that some young men here have been discussing in a mock parliament the matter of seines, etc., also the matter of slabs and sawdust being put in the river and which is claimed to kill young fish. That is a most important matter and one we will take up. I also see it stated that this Commission is now sitting in Victoria, and will make a report at an early day. We will now proceed to business.

WALTER ROOS, a native of Russia, a British subject, resident in Nanaimo for seven years, and describing himself as a deep-sea fisher, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Well, sir, if you have any remarks or suggestion, we will be glad to hear them.  
—A. Well, first, I will answer to your allusion to our mock parliament. I am the person that originated it here, and it is rather incorrectly reported. It is not the seining across the river, but a tug that is the trouble in the Gulf. I have had boats fishing these last three months. During that time, the principal fish that I have received—has been ling cod. A limited number of the northern cod, or some kind of cod that is caught on the Atlantic coast, or on the banks, are caught, but they are limited here. One day the man brought in twenty.

Q. Do you conflict them with black cod?—A. That is real genuine black cod. These fish are very small in size—not averaging over from four to seven pounds—none that I have caught any way. I have also caught some turbot. Now, I am not aware I have ever eaten nor seen turbot on the Pacific coast before. We have had, perhaps, a couple of dozen. They are very scarce, but the practical man I employ tells me the turbot goes in very deep water, and the deepest water we have so far tried is 150 fathoms. I may also say that halibut is to be caught in this district—not that I would warrant any outside fishermen, say from the east or anywhere else, to come here under the belief that there was a great halibut industry here, but there is halibut, and they are now and then brought in, and I know there is a halibut fishery within ten or fifteen miles. So far, the tawl has been a failure—both halibut and other fisheries. The great drawback is in regard to the disposal of the fish.

Q. Not for want of fish, but a market?—A. Oh, there is an abundant supply of ling cod, but not sufficient of halibut and turbot, not even to supply the local market; but ling, caught for sale, could have been caught every day, and could have been sold in very large quantities. Now, there is another point upon which I would like to turn upon, and which I would strongly recommend the Commission to advise the Government to prohibit, this herring fishing for oil. There has been such a thing as oil factories which have started up in various parts of Puget Sound, and other parts of British Columbia, and wherever these oil factories have run for any time, they have invariably destroyed the herring industry. They haul in herring in large seines by hundreds of tons, and the herrings are simply boiled or crushed—which ever process they undergo—and then the oil is taken out, and it has a great tendency to destroy that kind of fish. It is well known after seining, where herrings were very plentiful some years ago; they are very scarce now. It is the same over in Vancouver now, I believe, where an oil factory has been running for some time. I do not know as I have any further remarks to make—perhaps the Commission might like to ask me a few questions?

Q. We might ask you a few. You say you are experimenting as to whether it would be profitable to go into the deep-sea fisheries. At present you have got the ling

## Marine and Fisheries.

cod, the black cod, the halibut and the turbot. Now, how is ling distinguished from black cod? Do you know cod on the Atlantic?—A. No; they differ in some particulars. I have had Newfoundlanders fishing for me, and they tell me it cannot be dried—the flesh is too fat. In exposing it to the air, the fat works out to the fleshy side of the fish, and it turns yellow.

Q. And makes it rancid?—A. I suppose it does—the flesh turns yellow.

Q. Then ling cod here is the same as in Newfoundland?—A. No, they differ—the Atlantic cod has a sound, but these have not, their fins differ in some respects too.

Q. How about black cod—are they identical?—A. They are in many particulars—they have sounds.

Q. You say ling runs from 4 to 7 pounds? We noticed some cod in Victoria and New Westminster markets—they would range larger than that.—A. It would be the ling or black cod—the ling cod is a large fish—a very large fish.

Q. How big?—A. From 16 to 40 pounds.

Q. Then the black cod is a good eating fish?—A. Yes, it is a good saleable fish and where the local market cannot consume it, it can be cured and dried.

Q. How is your climate adapted for drying cod?—A. Oh, I think it is splendid.

Q. Then you think if a market was opened up the black cod, or your real cod as you term it, would become quite an article of commerce and would induce fishermen to come here?—A. Undoubtedly, but as I said before, there are but limited numbers of them.

Q. Would that be because few people were fishing for them or because they were few in numbers?—A. I think they are scarce in numbers.

Q. How far out have you fished for them?—A.—About 10 miles up.

Q. Are there any other persons who practice this mode of fishing?—A. I am not aware of them—Indians spear many of the ling cod, but I do not know if they get many of the right cod.

Q. Then you think a profitable industry for the province might be got up if there was an outlet for sale?—A. Yes, well right in Nanaimo it might be a difficult thing—for my experience would not warrant me to say it would be a success.

Q. Do you know if fish extend any length along the coast?—A. Oh yes, we have caught them 20 miles along the coast.

Q. Is the turbot like the turbot of the Atlantic coast?—A. Yes.

Q. And they would average?—A. About 5 pounds.

Q. A good well-meated fish?—A. Yes, splendid.

Q. What has been done with those caught?—A. They have been sold in the local market.

Q. Do you think them sufficiently numerous to make a commercial transaction if entered into fully?—A. Well, I have tried it for 3 months—it is a fish that swims in very deep water and the deepest that the men have fished is 150 fathoms.

Q. How do you catch them?—A. In trawls.

Q. And halibut you think not numerous?—A. Well, they may be according to the season of the year, because in Victoria I find in summer many halibut, while in winter they are very scarce. It may be but some years—of course, I have only tried this winter.

Q. Have you noticed in the Victoria papers and papers south, that vast quantities have been brought down?—A. Yes, steam-boats bring them from up north.

Q. But your experience is you have caught them, but you have not gone into the business sufficiently to say you have caught them numerously?—A. No, I have not.

Q. But you think from experience up north they would be here?—A. Well, I think they would be in the summer months.

Q. What is the average size of halibut here?—A. Forty-five pounds.

Q. You have caught larger?—A. Yes, some about eighty and ninety.

Q. And what market have you for them?—A. Only the local market for the few we have caught. I may also mention, as far as my experience goes, I would say the most important here is the oil fishery; in the industry alone, there must be from 100 to 150 men employed in that industry now, taking the fish for their oil.

Q. Would that include the small shark?—A. Yes.

Q. And is it wholly converted into oil?—A. No; only the liver, and the body is thrown away as offal; undoubtedly the small audience here to-day is due to the fact that these dog-fish men are now away from the city engaged in their work, about 14 miles north of here.

Q. Is any attempt made to make fertilizer out of the refuse?—A. No.

Q. Does it answer farmers' purposes to use it?—A. Oh, yes, it is a good fertilizer, but my experience of fertilizer is that it does not answer for root crops.

Q. For cereals would it answer?—A. For hay, oats and wheat I have seen it answer very well.

Q. Then at present the dog-fish oil industry employs some 100 to 150 hands, and the liver only is used, and the rest thrown away?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you any knowledge of the effects of that offal thrown away, or is the business sufficiently large to form any opinion?—A. Fishermen are of opinion that it injures the fisheries by throwing it away; they think it should be saved from going in the water, but it is not done.

Q. What do they do with it then?—A. They generally leave it on the beach and dogs, bears, etc., eat it.

Q. But their general impression is that it is injurious and they don't throw it in, but leave it on shore?—A. Yes.

Q. You spoke of herrings caught for oil being detrimental. Do you mean that catching large quantities of herring and using them reduces their numbers?—A. It is reducing their numbers, for you see a large factory can use from 100 to 150 tons a day; there is very little oil in herring, and there must be tremendous quantities used to make it a paying business.

Q. Do they make anything else out of it, fertilizer or anything?—A. I don't know.

Q. Is it for oil only?—A. I have no experience in the business.

Q. Will the profit be from oil or fertilizer, or both?—A. Both, I should think.

Q. Is the oil sold in considerable quantities?—A. I don't know.

Q. Where does it go?—A. I don't know.

Q. You only know there are factories and they consume large quantities of herring, but you do not know anything of the profits?—A. No; there was a factory here started but it is closed down.

Q. Then you think the herrings are reduced by such large quantities being caught and the refuse thrown in?—A. Oh, I think the refuse is taken away.

Q. What was the result in Vancouver?—A. The herring has become very scarce; I have heard from fishermen that they cannot get even any bait.

Q. And are there herrings there?—A. They are very scarce; it has killed out the herring industry to a very large extent.

Q. You spoke of large seines—the manner in which they catch them—you know what a purse seine is?—Yes.

Q. Do they use purse seines?—A. Yes.

Q. How far do they go out to catch them?—A. Oh, sometimes the school is out a piece—wherever they see a school, they go out and put their seines around them. The quantity of herring they catch can be got from the fact, that a small steamer from Victoria, in one haul, got twenty-five tons of herrings.

Q. Do you know what was done with them?—A. They were taken on the steamboat and taken to Victoria.

Q. What did they with twenty-five tons of herring there?—A. I think they sold it to fishermen, who sold it for bait.

Q. What fish do they catch with that bait?—A. Halibut, dog-fish, etc.

Q. Are any salmon caught along this coast?—A. Some, in the spring of the year.

Q. Are they caught entering the rivers or out off on the coasts?—A. No; I think the principal part are taken off the lighthouse.

Q. Does the Nanaimo River run in her?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do salmon come up the river at all?—A. Well, some may. The only ones I have known to come up are hooked-nosed salmon.

Q. Are they spring salmon or sockeye?—A. No. The hook-nosed salmon are not saleable at all.



## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. What season when they come in?—A. In the fall.

Q. And you never see them this time of the year?—A. No.

Q. Not between this and the fall?—A. No.

Q. What do you mean by hook-nosed salmon?—A. Well, there is a hook on the upper jaw.

Q. Wholly on the upper jaw or on the lower also?—A. Wholly on the upper jaw, I think. I have never seen any on the lower jaw.

Q. Do you know sockeye salmon?—A. Yes.

Q. Any in this river?—A. Well, there were some caught out in the harbour, but I do not think in the river.

Q. Can salmon go up the river—are there any obstructions?—A. I don't think so. There may be.

Q. There are no canneries about here?—A. No.

Q. Do you know anything of trout coming up the streams?—A. Yes; there are considerable quantities of large trout in the lake.

Q. What do you call large trout?—A. About twenty or twenty-five pounds.

Q. Would they be sea trout?—A. Well, the only two kinds I have ever heard of are salmon trout and mountain trout.

Q. The salmon trout would run what size?—A. Three and a half to four pounds.

Q. Might they not be the same fish?—A. No; I think the flesh differs. The mountain trout is nicer eating.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. You don't know what was done with offal from the factory that was established here?—A. It only ran a few days, and was stopped for some reasons which I don't know. There were plenty of herring, but still the factory was stopped.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Do you know if stopped by order of the town here as a nuisance, or anything of that kind?—A. No; I don't know.

Q. Thank you, Mr. Roos. Unless you have something else to suggest yourself, that will do?—A. No; I have nothing further.

FRAK VOZZAN, a native of Italy—10 years in British Columbia, formerly a fisherman on the Fraser River, but now a dog-fish fisherman, a resident of Nanaimo, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Well, what have you to say, sir?—A. Well, I was on the Fraser River before I came here—and then by that license business—when we could not get any more licenses I came here and fished for dog-fish.

Q. You are desirous of getting licenses to fish in the Fraser River?—A. And here too.

Q. Licenses in the Fraser River would be for salmon fishing and here for every kind of fish you could catch?—A. Yes, for dog-fish principally.

Q. You had license on the Fraser River?—A. Yes, I had licenses right along for six years.

Q. And did you make application for licenses lately?—A. Yes, but they would not give it to me—they gave to other people—new hands that came in, but not to all hands.

Q. Have you become a British subject by taking out the necessary papers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then you are actually a British subject, as far as naturalization is concerned?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long since you took out papers?—A. About three years ago.

Q. And you got licenses on the Fraser River before you took out papers?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And when you applied lately you were refused—why?—A. Well, they said they were so many licenses given out and they could not give any more.

Q. How many years did you fish on the Fraser?—A. Well, since 1882 I have fished in the Fraser River.

Q. What portion did you fish in?—A. Well, from Mr. Ewen's and all along the river—all about the sand heads and upwards.

Q. Did you ever keep count of the fish you caught?—Yes, sometimes I did.

Q. What average would you take in a season? when you fished for sockeye?—A. Well, we finished for spring salmon and sockeye—we didn't fish for—

Q. Well, in a good season—how many would you catch?—A. In a big season we might get 500 or 600 a day—in a poor run we might average 40 a day.

Q. What did you get for your fish—how much?—A. Well, generally 10 cents.

Q. Did you ever get more fish than you could dispose of?—A. No, I caught only those they would take from me.

Q. Did you ever catch more than they would take from you?—A. Well, sometimes I did, but I had to give them away for nothing, sometimes I salted them.

Q. Were you in the habit of throwing them away in the water?—A. No, I never did that.

Q. Were you aware others did that?—A. No, I never saw anybody throw them away—we gave them to the Indians to dry—the Indians will take them any time.

Q. Where did you live when there?—A. In a small shoop—eight or ten tons.

Q. Was offal thrown into the river then?—A. Yes, well they threw it under the canneries.

Q. Do you think the offal gave any injurious effects to the water, or fish, or health?—A. Well, I don't think so, because the heavy freshets of the river would carry it all away.

Q. You don't think it any harm to the river, fish, or health?—A. No, I don't think it does any harm.

Q. Have you been fishing here?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you had any license?—A. Well, no one asked me for license.

Q. What kind of fish do you catch here?—A. Rock cod, ling, halibut, etc.

Q. The same as this gentleman stated before you?—Yes, sir.

Q. Do you find a market for all you catch?—A. Well, we get them away as well as we can.

Q. Do you catch any sockeye?—A. No; I hear some Indians got them out by the lighthouse, but I never got any.

Q. Any spring salmon?—A. Yes; in the winter.

Q. Where do you catch those spring salmon?—A. Well, in Departure Bay and other places. Whenever there is any herring around, they follow the herring.

Q. What average size would you catch here?—A. About 25 lbs.

Q. Do you find any spring salmon red and white meated or all one colour?—A. Yes; both red and white.

Q. Which is best?—A. Well, lots of people think the red, but I think the white is richest.

Q. Can you sell all you catch here?—A. Yes; in the winter. There is a great market here in the winter.

Q. But just to use themselves, or does anybody send them away anywhere else?—A. Well, I don't know. I don't think they send them away.

Q. Have you seen any spring salmon up the rivers?—A. Sometimes they go up a little piece, but in shallow water they cannot go far up.

Q. When do you see this?—A. In December.

Q. Do you know when they spawn; when they lay their eggs?—A. No; I don't know.

Q. Do you know where they go to spawn?—A. No; I don't know. Some say Nanaimo River, but I don't know.

Q. Do they go up in December?—A. Yes; in December, January, and those months.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. And you catch them out on these coasts in those months?—A. Yes, in March, April and May.

Q. What do you catch in May?—A. Well, when the herring leaves the coast the fishing is played out, except what you catch along the shore; ling cod, etc.

Q. How many fishermen are engaged here?—A. About 50 more or less.

Q. And they all pursue fishing the same as you do; the same kind of fish?—A. Yes; sir.

Q. What net do you use?—A. What for?

Q. For salmon?—A. Well, we catch salmon in the same sized mesh as we catch the dog-fish.

Q. What size would that be?—A. 6½ inches.

Q. Is it a floating net or what?—A. No; we sink it to the bottom. There is no tide there and it rests on the bottom.

Q. You don't fasten it with stakes or anything?—A. No.

Q. What is the height of tide here?—A. About 14 feet.

Q. A pretty good tide, is it not?—A. Yes; sir.

Q. And you fish with a net with lead lines taking the bottom and the cork lines on top?—A. No, sir; the lead lines are not always on the bottom.

Q. But the cork lines are on the surface?—A. Oh, yes; sir.

Q. Do you fish with seines?—A. Yes; sometimes.

Q. And what is the seine like?—A. A bag seine.

Q. And what length?—A. About 150 fathoms.

Q. And what size of mesh in that net?—A. In the bag it will be small mesh, 1½ inch, and as you get out to the edges it will be larger.

Q. What size in the bag?—A. About an inch mesh.

C. Extension measure or square?—A. Extension.

Q. Then inch mesh would make ½ inch square?—A. Yes, about ½ inch square—it makes over an inch when stretched out.

Q. What do you catch in this net?—A. Some rock cod, flounders—sometimes ling cod.

Q. What small fish do you get in it?—A. Little tommy coals.

Q. Any gulachons?—A. No sir.

Q. Any small trout?—A. Sometimes—very seldom.

Q. And young salmon?—A. Very seldom.

Q. But you do catch some now and then?—A. Very seldom.

Q. And the young salmon—what size would it be?—A. Only about two pounds.

Q. Do you ever catch any little salmon—6 or 8 inches long?—A. Oh no, they go through the mesh.

Q. How can they go through half inch mesh?—A. Well, sometimes they may get them, but it is very seldom we get so small as that.

Q. And when you take in the seine you take them all, rock cod, little salmon and all kinds?—A. What do you do with little fish that are so small you cannot sell them?—A. Well, we always let them go, they are no use to us.

Q. How do you let them out?—A. Well, we just let down the net and they walk away themselves.

Q. Do all go away alive?—A. Oh yes, part of them.

Q. Do you ever haul your seine on shore and after picking out the large ones, leave the small ones there?—A. Well, there are some little ones that have no chance to get away and they remain there.

Q. Where do you haul these seines, in the harbour here?—A. Sometimes outside and sometimes in the harbour. Generally between here and Departure Bay.

Q. Do these other brother fishermen fish that way with seines?—A. No, I have not seen one.

Q. Only yourself fishing with a seine?—A. Well, there may be some from Cowichan Bay and if they went for bait they will fish with a seine. We don't fish all the time with a seine.

Q. But fishermen from Cowichan do the same as yourself?—A. Cowichan Gap, yes there are some do the same.

Q. And then your principal object in coming here is that you want license to fish here and in the Fraser River as well?—A. Yes sir.

Q. You want drift net license as well as seine?—A. Yes.

Q. But if restricted to only one which would you want?—A. I would rather have one to fish in Fraser River.

Q. That is salmon license with 6 inch mesh—5? rather?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you ever fish down at Cowichan?—A. No sir, I have fished down there six years ago but not lately.

Q. Have you anything else you wish to bring before the Commission?—A. No sir.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Thank you.

BARTHOLEMEW LACOSTE, a native of Italy, a British subject, 12 years living in British Columbia, a resident of Nanaimo, a fisherman, was duly sworn.

By Mr. Wilnot:

Q. Well sir, what do you want?—A. I want a license.

Q. Have you ever applied for them?—A. Yes, I fished in 1882, in the Fraser River, and then came up here.

Q. Have you ever had licenses on the Fraser River?—A. I fished with the previous witness, Frank Vozan.

Q. The same license did you both?—A. Yes, we fished together.

Q. Do you endorse what he says as to fishing on Fraser River, the quantity of fish caught, etc.?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you use a seine here to?—A. Yes, sometimes.

Q. And do you catch fish of the same kind?—A. Yes, the same kind.

Q. With seine meshes, bag-net?—A. Yes, I fished with the last witness, we are partners.

Q. And you corroborate what he says?—A. Yes.

Q. And you want a license?—A. Yes, I want a license, that is all; I want to fish for salmon in Fraser River, and go there in the fishing season and fish.

Mr. WILNOT.—Well, sir, we have your statement down, unless you have something further to say, that will do.

D. S. McDONALD, a native of Scotland, 16 years in British Columbia, a merchant, and resident of Nanaimo, was duly sworn.

By Mr. Wilnot:

Q. Now, sir, what do you desire to say?—A. Well, there is one thing I observed last summer, the stream that goes out from off side of this harbour: there are three lakes connected with it; Fishhawk Lake, Thunder Lake and Troby Lake; the stream goes through from the upper lake right straight down through, and there is a little outlet goes into the second lake, and there is a dam which stops fish.

Q. Which is farthest up?—A. Fishhawk Lake, the next is Thunder Lake, and the last is Troby Lake. I have a little diagram here from which you will understand the positions (showing Chairman diagram).

Q. And how far is the dam from the tide water?—A. Well, the tide backs up to the dam.

Q. Well, what do you want to say about this?—A. My object I will explain to you. I am very fond of the fishing rod: 10 or 12 years ago, I used to go to either of those lakes and catch trout, but since the dam has been across you cannot catch one of them.

Q. What is the height of this dam?—A. Well, I cannot say; it stops the tide from going up; there is a flood-gate on it, and the water comes and shuts the gate.

Q. And any fish going up would be stopped or fish coming down?—A. I think the water is so low when the tide goes out that fish cannot come out in that particular place.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. But any fish coming down and the flood gate open; fish could come down could they not!—A. Yes.

Q. What size is the stream from Troboy Lake!—A. Well, in summer time about 15 or 20 feet across.

Q. And of what depth! What kind of bottom!—A. Gravelly bottom.

Q. Is it pure clear water as a rule, except in freshets!—A. Well, from Troboy Lake it has muddy streams flowing into it, etc., but from the dam up it is clear water for say two miles.

Q. What fish do you catch there!—A. Trout.

Q. What do you mean by trout!—A. The salmon trout;—I don't think there is any mountain trout here.

Q. You have been in the eastern country!—A. Yes; I have been all through Nova Scotia, and the trout we catch there has a small red spot and we never catch them here.

Q. Then the speckled trout are not here!—A. No, I think they are young salmon trout. There are large salmon trout caught, six or seven pounds, up at the falls, and they resemble these very much.

Q. The only thing is, I find there is a considerable difference of opinion here on this matter; now, what is your description of salmon trout!—A. Well, the scales of parr is larger.

Q. What do you then call "parr"!—A. A young salmon about six inches long.

Q. With a band along the sides and spots!—A. No; those I call the trout.

Q. But they are young salmon in a different stage. Well, these ones you get in the lakes!—A. I call them salmon trout. They are marked across the body and have no spots on them.

Q. Are you prepared to say they were not young salmon!—A. To the best of my belief they are young salmon.

Q. And would be produced by salmon going up to those lakes and going into smaller streams to breed!—A. Yes.

Q. And the killing of these—do you consider it objectionable as against allowing them to come down and become full-grown!—A. Well, that size—you never take them out with hook and line.

Q. But as they get larger you would!—A. Yes; in a different stage.

Q. But don't you think it injurious to kill those salmon!—A. Yes; but it is more injurious to spoil the stream and not let them go up at all.

Q. Yes, but if you kill them off, you will have none at all!—A. Well, but that is looking very far ahead. Probably the plovers would get them, anyway.

Q. Then you say the dam should be removed to let salmon pass up and breed!—A. Yes.

Q. And should I say to let you catch them with a fly!—A. Well, they have got scarce since the dam has been there.

Q. But I think it a bad argument for you to say that the dam should be removed to save the fish, so you could kill them with a fly!—A. Perhaps it is a selfish motive.

Q. What is the dam up here for! Any motive power or manufactory!—A. No—to prevent the land being flooded above.

Q. Is the land occupied by farmers above this gate!—A. I cannot tell you.

Q. Are there any residents there!—A. Oh, yes; on the high land there is. I cannot say how many acres would be flooded.

Q. Then the stoppage of the water benefits how many!—A. Only one farmer, and it prevents fish from going up to breed.

Q. Is this dam on his own land!—A. I cannot tell you. To the best of my knowledge it is, but I don't know.

Q. Well, it does not matter.—No man has the right to stop the passage of fish up stream.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. He effectually stops them then!—A. Yes.

Q. And you desire to see the law made, if there is none now, to stop this!—A. Yea.

(Voice from audience.)—Three years ago there was a petition got up to stop this.

*By Mr. Armstrong :*

Q. Well, I may say it is against the law now to do this. Any of you can go to a magistrate here and have any one fined who does this.—A. Well, I wanted to know if it was right that this man should do this. If it is wrong, why it is wrong to me and the balance of the community.

Q. There is no doubt it is wrong, sir, as far as the law is concerned, but I, of course, cannot decide such matters or give you advice on the matter. However, your statement is re-ordered, and it will appear before the authorities, and will be taken up with other matters in connection with the fisheries of British Columbia.

P. S. CURRY, a native of England, 22 years in British Columbia—a resident of Nanaimo, and describing himself as an Indian trader, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Have you anything to say relative to this stoppage at the dam!—A. Well, I have nothing much to say, but every one is of my opinion, that the dam was stopping the fish from going up. There used to be good fishing some years ago, but now there is no trout at all—I know three years ago there was a petition got up among the settlers to have this dam taken down.

Q. To whom did the petition go to!—A. I don't know—or whether it was ever sent.

Q. Did you sign it!—A. No—I was not a settler.

Q. Who is your fishery officer here!—A. We have none—at the time the petition was got up it was Charles York.

Q. Is not Mr. Malpas here!—A. Yes.

Q. And you don't know whether the petition was sent to York or not!—A. I don't know—but I know every one is of the same opinion that the dam is injurious to the lakes.

Q. Is it your impression too!—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the dam made of—earth or wood!—A. Both, I think—I have seen it once.

Q. A log dam with earth thrown upon it!—A. Yes.

Q. And this swing gate in the middle!—A. Yes, it is only for preventing the water from going on some hay lands.

Q. And what space would the gate leave!—A. About three feet—somewhere near that.

Q. Then water would rush through very rapidly when the tide was coming in and would shut the gate quickly!—A. Yes, it is simply for keeping the water from going on the land.

Q. Then you have heard that gentlemen before you speak with regard to the lakes—do you corroborate that!—A. All except I differ with him as regards the trout—he calls them salmon—I call them fresh water trout.

Q. What is it marked like!—A. Different marks on them—some spotted and streaked.

Q. You are not prepared to say they are young salmon!—A. I don't think them young salmon.

Q. Have you sufficient experience to say whether they are young salmon or trout!—A. I never fished for salmon—they were all trout that came to my net. (Laugh).

Q. And whoever sells them—they would say they were young salmon, I suppose! (Laughter.) I may say it is very difficult for any one to tell between young salmon and trout but they can be told. And you would catch different coloured fish from the different lakes—I think it is on account of the bottom—in a muddy bottomed lake, you

## Marine and Fisheries.

will catch them different to the gravelly bottom. Have you anything to say as to the big salmon?—A. No, I don't know anything about them, except I have seen them going up streams.

Q. Oh, you have in these streams spoken of?—A. Yes.

Q. What like—about what size?—A. Oh, weighing about twenty or twenty-five pounds.

Q. Yes, the spring salmon—when do you see them going up?—A. In the fall—after the rains have made the streams bigger.

Q. Well, that is the strongest evidence you could give that these little fish were salmon, because the big fish go up in the fall to deposit their eggs and then these are the little fish that come afterwards. (Laughter.)

Mr. CURRY.—Is there not a proper close season for trout fishing here?

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes; sir.

WITNESS.—Would you tell me when it closes? Some say one thing is the law and some another?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, the law is at present that no one shall kill trout from 15th October to 15th March.

Mr. CURRY.—Is that for the angler?

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, well it does not matter.

WITNESS.—Well, many have different opinions. They think if fishing with a fly, they can fish any time.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, no; you see there is a certain time when the trout breed, too; and the angler would destroy them, too; it does not matter, angler, spearsman, net fisherman, or Indian, all are equally prohibited during the close time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (to Witness).—Thank you, sir.

EDWARD QUESNELLE, a native of England, 26 years in British Columbia, a resident of Nanaino, and by occupation a butcher, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. What have you to say?—A. It was just in regard to the evidence about fish in Fish-Hawk Lake. I used to log near there a few years ago. Before the dam was put across we used to get salmon in plenty; even in the ditches, we got two kinds.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. What is the name of this stream?—A. It has no name; it is a small outlet from these two lakes.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. How far from here?—A. Oh, about two or three miles.

Q. And Fish-Hawk Lake?—A. About eight miles.

Q. And the whole extent of stream from Fish-Hawk Lake?—A. From Fish-Hawk Lake down to salt water at the dam, 5 miles.

Q. And how long is Fish-Hawk Lake?—A. The longest part, 3 miles and average width  $\frac{1}{2}$  of a mile.

Q. Are there any small streams running into Fish-Hawk Lake?—A. Yes; several of them. What I wanted to state was, that before the dam was placed there the salmon went up regularly every year about the month of September. It varied sometimes, but after the dam was put across, the salmon stopped coming up.

Q. You have seen them caught up there in years gone by?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. And at any time?—A. Yes.

Q. And the size of the larger salmon?—A. 15, 20 and 25 lbs.; and the smaller ones 6 to 8 or 10 lbs.

Q. Were smaller ones numerous?—A. No; the larger ones were the most.

Q. What comparative difference; would the larger ones be double the smaller ones?—A. Oh, yes; there were only a few small ones, and after they went up the ditches would be covered with spawn.

Q. Did the smaller ones spawn?—A. Well, I don't know. I don't think so.

Q. Were the smaller ones same as the big ones, only smaller?—A. No; they did not look the same.

Q. Do you think they are the young of the large? Did you ever hear them called grilse?—A. No; they seemed to be somewhat red.

Q. Yes; that would be the sockeye salmon, and would the spawning places be gravelly bottom?—A. Yes.

Q. How do you know they were spawning there?—A. Well, we knew because we used to see the eggs there in the ditches.

Q. Would you see places where the gravel would be removed by the fish?—A. I never took that much notice. We used to see eggs sometimes in piles and sometimes scattered out.

Q. And they used to be caught pretty numerous?—A. Yes; you could catch as many as you had a mind to—you could take them out with a pitchfork.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. But how did you catch them as a rule?—A. Well, we used to get in the ditch and take them out.

Q. How many would you catch?—A. Oh, we only caught a few for our own use.

Q. But you could have caught many of them?—A. Oh, yes; as many as we had a mind to.

Q. And you think this dam has prevented fish from going up?—A. Yes.

Q. And the fish have become exterminated?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you any other rivers here similarly situated except the dam?—A. Oh yes; the Nanaimo River, and the Chase River.

Q. Do they still go up these rivers?—A. Yes; the Nanaimo River especially.

Q. Would they appear in about the same proportions as between the two kinds?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. And many salmon go up the Nanaimo now?—A. Yes, at the same time of year as they used to in the other.

Q. And they kill young, in numbers while going up?—A. Principally by the Indians.

Q. And are many caught in the estuaries at the sea?—A. They don't catch them like they do on the Fraser River, but they could catch them if they wanted to.

Q. Are there any lakes on the Nanaimo River?—A. Yes; small ones.

Q. And anything to prevent fish going up there?—A. No.

Q. Do you see many dead fish any time in the Nanaimo River?—Yes; a great many.

Q. Do you think any return to the sea after going up to spawn?—A. Yes; a great many get killed and die but many return.

Q. Do you know this to be the case in this other stream?—A. Yes; before the dam was put in, but we found few dead ones there—it was a short stream and easier to get up.

Q. How long is the Nanaimo River up to the lakes?—A. About 20 miles to the first lakes, and 20 beyond that to the other lakes.

Q. Do you know some of them return from the upper lakes?—A. I don't know.

Q. Have you any oyster beds around here?—A. None nearer than Oyster Bay—there is one up north at Nanoose Bay.

Q. Are they fished very much?—A. I don't think any one fishes there except Indians—in Oyster Bay two or three whitemen fish there.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Have you any experience in fishing for halibut?—A. Not for halibut—I have for cod and salmon.

Q. What is the value of the big salmon in the market here?—A. \$1 a-piece.

Q. And the small salmon?—A. Down to ten cents or a "bit."

Q. Then you conclude in your mind that this dam has a tendency to destroy that particular family of fish that belonged to Fish-Hawk Lake?—A. Yes.



## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. And that Nanaimo River is still frequented by considerable numbers of spring salmon and the smaller fish?—A. Yes, sir.

*By Mr. Armstrong :*

Q. Do you know anything about the sea fishing here?—A. No.

Q. It has been stated you know, that they use these small mesh nets and haul up large quantities of these small fish on the beach after taking out those for market, and leave the smaller ones to rot on the beach?—A. Yes.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. The object of my colleague and myself in asking these questions about the seines is, that it is feared that many young salmon are caught and thus ruthlessly destroyed.—A. Oh, they don't catch many young salmon outside.

Q. Do you deal in fish at all?—A. Only for what I require for my own use.

Q. Is there a fish market here?—A. Yes.

Q. What fish are generally brought in?—A. Codfish, salmon, and all kinds.

Q. Do you know anything about the oyster fishery at all?—No, sir.

Mr. William Roos, who had previously given evidence, here stated :—

"It is absolutely necessary to use small meshed seines to catch the fish they require. They would catch none unless allowed to use the small mesh, as herring often were very small and go through very fine mesh. In a whole season I have caught only three or four young salmon, and it is really necessary to have half-inch mesh in the bunt of the seine."

The Commission adjourned at 5.20 p.m., to meet again in the same place at 10 a.m., on 10th March.

NANAIMO, 10th March, 1892.

### *Morning Session.*

The Commission was convened at 10 a.m.

Present: Mr. S. Wilmot, in the Chair: Mr. Sheriff Armstrong, and Mr. Secretary Winter.

Mr. WILLIAM GREEN, a native of England, five years in British Columbia, resident of Nanaimo, describing himself as a trader, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Well, what would you like to put before the Commission?—A. Well, about five years ago I was residing on Naas River.

Q. Oh, yes; the Naas River—very well, sir?—A. Well, up where the Indians are—some distance up river from where the fishermen are allowed to throw out their nets, there is any quantity of fish, both spring salmon, silver salmon, and cohoes. The cohoes only run late in the fall—the Indians put out seines in the river and in the small rivers that flow into it.

Q. It is Naas River you are speaking of more particularly?—A. Yes; there are three canneries there now. Fish is very scarce, and fifty or eighty miles up the Indians put seines across the streams and catch any quantity of fish and destroy large numbers of them.

Q. Then this seine fishing by Indians is beyond where the ordinary drift nets are used?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have been on the river?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. You know where the boundary for fishing there is?—A. Yes.

Q. About sixteen or twenty miles beyond the British Columbia cannery?—A. Yes.

Q. And this fishing is beyond that?—A. Yes; the Indians catch them to extremes—more than they do for food.

Q. How far up from the British Columbia cannery; have you ever been on the lakes on Naas River!—A. Oh, yes; the lakes are up 40 or 50 miles from the river, and spring salmon run from the lakes into the river.

Q. Yes; and small tributaries as well running into the lake!—A. Yes.

Q. And is fishing carried on at the lake!—A. No; right in the rivers and at mouths of rivers running in.

Q. And is it late; do the fish come up to spawn!—A. Yes.

Q. And they are fished by the Indians; drift nets or seines!—A. They just put them across the streams and haul them in in hundreds at a time; I would say that after that I resided at the Forks of the Skeena.

Q. Well, before we leave the Naas River—so the Indians catch these fish by hauling their seines across the stream!—A. Yes.

Q. And do they catch more than they want for individual use!—A. Yes.

Q. What do they do with them!—A. Well, when they catch them they clean them and dry them for their own use.

Q. Do they take any down to the canneries!—A. No; only for their own use. They catch perhaps 1,000 in a day; they clean as many as they can and the rest of course they lay there and rot.

Q. And would they be mostly silver salmon or sockeye!—A. Both the silver and the sockeye.

Q. And which do the Indians prefer!—A. The sockeye.

Q. And do they take the spring salmon!—A. Yes; they take them down to the canneries.

Q. And not sockeyes to the canneries!—A. No; not to my knowledge.

Q. They send spring salmon down to the canneries, but sockeye they keep for their own use!—A. Yes.

Q. What number of streams you think run into Naas River above the limit for fishing and the lake!—A. There are numerous streams.

Q. And Indians are engaged fishing in them!—A. Well, there are three streams about 50 miles above the cannery, and it is there the Indians catch the fish.

Q. Can you form an estimate of the average weight and size of these spring salmon they catch!—A. About 35 pounds.

Q. How large have you seen them; the largest for instance!—A. The largest I have seen I think weighed 78 pounds.

Q. Indeed! An enormous fish. Would these fish be white-meated or red!—A. Red.

Q. Have you known of any being white-meated!—A. Yes.

Q. What proportion!—A. About equal.

Q. Which is considered the best!—A. Well, the cannerymen say they can both kinds and they say they find a better market for white than red.

Q. Have you ever travelled up any of these small streams yourself? Any distance from the main river!—A. Well, I have not followed them any distance from the main river right along, but I have gone up Naas River and then gone over the mountains for about 180 miles.

Q. Would these streams be large!—A. Yes; a pretty good size.

Q. And all frequented by salmon!—A. Yes; salmon all up the streams.

Q. May I ask your calling up there!—A. Well, at the time I walked over I was trading at the Skeena.

Q. Do these last remarks you made apply to Naas or Skeena!—A. Well, these streams from the lakes flow into Naas River.

Q. And now you are referring to the Skeena!—A. Yes.

Q. Well, what about the Skeena!—A. Well, I was residing on the Forks of the Skeena trading among the Indians and some distance from the Forks there is a river called Kiashbiash.

Q. Is that near Babine Lake!—A. No, I think Babine Lake is about 50 miles beyond.

Q. And you are now speaking of the limit between Babine Lake and tidal water!—A. Yes. Well, you see the Babine Lake is between the Skeena River and Abbot River, and I am speaking of below this. At Kiashbiash River there is a large Indian

## Marine and Fisheries.

village there, and all the Indians put out traps—I have seen fifty or sixty traps there. They have piles across the river and they just let a basket down and they catch any quantity of fish.

Q. Would these be spring salmon?—A. No, the silver salmon or sockeye.

Q. Not the cohoes?—A. No.

Q. Well?—A. Well, you see having all these traps across the river and catching any quantity of fish there, it makes more limited fish down on the river and where the cannerymen are complaining of scarcity of fish.

Q. Do Indians catch fish in these traps for the canneries?—A. No, just for their own use.

Q. What number of Indians are there?—A. There is a tribe of between 300 and 400 and about forty or fifty are left to catch fish during the summer and the rest go down to fish for the canneries.

Q. Can you form any estimate of what these forty or fifty Indians would catch during the season?—A. No, I could not say, but of course it is a great many.

Q. And all are dried?—A. Yes.

Q. And those are principally silver salmon or sockeye?—A. Yes.

Q. Then there are lots caught with seine below the town of Hazelton? Are these traps above or below Hazelton?—A. About seven miles above—on the Kiashbiash River.

Q. The Indians would want to catch them for their own food?—A. Yes.

Q. Are salmon less plenty in the Skeena than formerly?—A. Well, I could not say—only what cannerymen say—and fish do not seem to be running as plentifully as they used to do.

Q. Would you say that was because canneries catch so many or because of the great catch by the Indians?—A. Well, I think if there was some one there to see these Indian let many of them go it would be better.

Q. And do they catch more than they really want—they seldom do so?—A. Oh, yes; they catch more than they want—last summer on the Kiashbiash River I saw any quantity of fish lying dead—the Indians get them and take the roe out of them and leave the bodies lying there.

Q. And that would be well on in the spawning season?—A. Yes.

Q. And they dry the roe for their own use?—A. Yes, they dry the roe.

Q. Do you know anything about the young salmon—their natural history, etc.?—

A. No, but I might say there are quite a number of lakes around Hazelton and they are full of fish.

Q. Do you know if these Indians catch the young fish by traps or otherwise?—A. No, but they go out in winter and cut holes through the ice and bring them into Hazelton.

Q. What size would they be?—A. I have seen baskets weighing two and three pounds—the average would be about two and half.

Q. And could you say they were salmon?—A. No, I could not say so.

Q. It is not likely they would be salmon, because they would be either very little or would be bigger?—A. I may say last summer I was on the river and found an Indian village and traps across and great quantities of them lying around.

Q. And that was the system, you think, of the Indians from time immemorial before the canneries could be established?—A. Yes.

Q. And now do you think the habit of Indians catching fish from time immemorial would effect the run of fish in the river? They always get plenty of food?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. And then this reduction must be put to the canners, would it not?—A. Well, of course, there have been more canneries gone up lately.

Q. Yes. I think there are eight canneries on mouth of the Skeena?—A. Yes.

Q. And these eight canneries would take a large amount of fish, and I should think it would be that they would effect the fish more than the quantity caught by the Indians—don't you think so?—A. Yes; I would think so.

Q. Because you see the Indians have gone on from time to time, and caught their fish from the main supply, but now the supply is otherwise reduced?—A. Yes.

Q. And the Indians do not take the fish caught up river down to the canneries for sale?—A. No; it is for their own use.

Q. Do Indians, fishing at the canneries, ever take home any salted fish for their domestic use in winter!—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Because it is stated that the white salmon are given to the Indians for their use—now, could they carry these up to their villages!—A. No, sir. I know last summer, up there, we would go out and the Indians would just put their pole down anywhere and get a salmon.

Q. Then you don't think it probable that the Indians would take them up for their own use!—A. No; though they might use them while at the cannery.

Q. Do the Indians prefer the white salmon!—A. I am sure I could not say.

Q. I suppose you know the white salmon is not quite so marketable as the red!—A. Yes; but we heard last summer from cannerymen they were going to can the white salmon because it is just as good as the red.

Q. You are speaking of spring salmon!—A. Yes.

Q. And they catch them up to seventy and eighty pounds!—A. Yes.

Q. An enormous fish!—A. Yes. Even in winter I know the Indians go out and haul up very big fish.

Q. They would then be very low—they would not be good, I should think!—A. Yes; they are very good.

Q. Are there many white people at Hazelton!—A. Yes; the Hudson Bay Company have quite a store and Mr. Cunningham.

Q. Do the Hudson Bay Company catch many fish there!—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. The Indians are supposed to catch their own fish!—A. Yes.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. You say, Mr. Green, the fish are considerably reduced in Naas River—are they reduced to the same extent in the Skeena!—No. Of course, there are three canneries on Naas River, but the Naas is not so large as the Skeena.

Q. And you think fish are not reduced as much on the Skeena as on the Naas!—A. No.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Yes. You see there are three canneries on Naas, and eight on the Skeena, but the Naas is a much smaller river—would it be half as large as the Skeena!—A. No; not half as large.

Q. I see from a description I have of it, a short distance above the "Windsor" cannery it is three-quarters of a mile wide, and the Naas River at the boundary is only about 1,200 feet wide. Does the Indian fish on Sunday for their own use or do they keep the Sunday!—A. They do on the Naas, but on the Skeena they do not.

Q. But in fishing for the canneries do they care about fishing on Sunday!—A. No, they don't.

Q. There are missionaries there!—A. Yes.

Q. And they are led pretty much by the missionaries are they!—A. Yes.

Q. Do cannerymen fish on Sunday at all!—A. No, I don't think so—the Sunday is kept.

Q. You are the only person we have found who has actually travelled over the ground there, and it is very good information which you have given us. Do you know anything of sea fishing!—A. No sir.

Q. The Indians are not engaged in that—they are always waiting for the salmon!—A. Yes; they wait for the salmon.

Q. Are there missionaries up at the mouth of the river at Hazelton!—A. No, not at Hazelton.

Q. Do Indians stay at the cannery in winter or go up river!—A. There is an Indian village at Mr. Cunningham's cannery, but most of them go to Fort Simpson.

Q. Where is Fort Simpson—how far from the "Windsor" cannery!—A. About fifty miles from Skeena River—they have to go across the gulf to reach it.

Q. I don't think we can ask you anything else—we have got very good information from you and are much obliged to you.

No further evidence being forthcoming the Commission adjourned at 11.20 a.m. to meet again at 3 o'clock p.m., at the same place.

## Marine and Fisheries.

NANAIMO, 10th March, 1892.

### *Afternoon Session.*

The Commission assembled at the City Hall, at 3.45 p.m.

Present:—Mr. S. Wilmot in the Chair; Mr. Sheriff Armstrong, and Mr. Secretary Winter.

No evidence being forthcoming, the Chairman, at 4.25 p.m., declared the Commission adjourned, to meet again at Vancouver, at 10 a.m., on Saturday, 12th March, 1892.

VANCOUVER, B.C., March 12th, 1892.

### *Morning Session.*

The Commission was convened in the Court House at 10 a.m.

Present:—Mr. S. Wilmot, in the Chair; Hon. D. W. Higgins, Mr. Sheriff Armstrong and Mr. Secretary Winter.

The Chairman (after calling the meeting to order, the room being well filled by the public) in declaring this Commission open, said to his brother colleagues and others, I may mention in a hurried manner the object on the Commission so no misunderstanding may arise about it. The object of the Commission is to get all the information possible about the fish and fisheries of British Columbia. Disputes for a long time have existed with cannerymen and others with regard to the Fraser River fisheries particularly, and this has culminated in having a Commission appointed. Mr. Higgins and Mr. Armstrong were appointed on behalf of the province, and I was appointed to sit with them. We have proceeded with business so far with some 8 or 10 days at New Westminster where some 70 witnesses were examined, both cannerymen and fishermen. We then proceeded to Victoria and got information from cannerymen and others on northern rivers, etc., we then adjourned to Nanaimo. Before leaving Victoria, we passed a resolution that we would come to Vancouver—our object in coming here was more particularly with the view of obtaining information about the deep-sea fisheries, which I understand are here entered into largely. So far, our meetings have been harmonious, particularly at New Westminster and Nanaimo—a little jarring took place at Victoria, and I hope we will get along here harmoniously. We expect to get through here this afternoon or evening, and it is important we get through as soon as possible, as many important questions are pending our decision. We will proceed to take evidence from any one here who chooses to give it. We will particularly like to hear about the halibut and deep sea fisheries and I will now declare this Commission open. (To the Commissioners.) Would it not be better to arrange about our adjournment from here so the public can know of our movements?

Mr. HIGGINS:—Oh, we can sit to-day, and this afternoon, if necessary, can state our further movements.

Mr. WILMOT:—Well, then, will it be understood that we will sit here to-day and adjourn, and when we adjourn from here we will adjourn to New Westminster, with the view of going down the river to inspect it as well as we can at this season of the year. The Commission will endeavour to get some sort of craft and go down and inspect the river on Monday.

Mr. HIGGINS:—Yes, Monday will be the last day I can be here.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:—Yes, that will do.

Mr. R. V. WINCH, a native of Canada, 6 years in British Columbia, a fish merchant, and resident in Vancouver, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Well, now sir, have you anything to represent to this Commission with regard to the salmon fisheries or other fisheries of British Columbia?—A. Well, with regard to the salmon fishery I only wish to state, with regard to licenses we are not properly supplied with licenses in this city for the fresh fish market—there is a kind of monopoly now as matters stand.

Mr. WILMOT :—Perhaps it would be just as well if Mr. Inspector McNabb would state the directions he has just received from Ottawa, on the subject of licenses.

Mr. McNABB handed in a letter, dated 3rd March, 1892, which he had recently received from the department at Ottawa, authorizing him to issue 100 interim licenses, and which was read by the Chairman.

Mr. WILMOT :—As you were speaking about licenses to supply the local trade for the time being, I may state for the information of yourself and others present that during the sittings of the board in New Westminster many enquiries were made in regard to interim licenses and a suggestion was sent to the minister that interim licenses might be issued in the meantime to those who were fishing for local trade until something definite was decided in regard to standing regulations or any altered ones, and that a fee of \$10 should be paid for these licenses and that this fee would go to account for any further license issued afterwards. This is simply to permit the local traders and fishermen to go on with their work now. This does not, I understand, apply to canners who do not fish until later in June or July—I merely state this so all may understand it.

Mr. WINCH :—With regard to the numbers, sir.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. The inference to be drawn is that each *bona fide* British subject and fisherman should be entitled to one license, and I presume from the wording of the correspondence on the subject, that freezers and exporters would be entitled to two licenses, so if they want more fish than those two would supply them with, they can buy from regular fishermen—it is put forth, as explained, in order to allow fishermen to go on with their work for local trade and export trade in spring salmon!—A. Well, I think that would cover my ground—you see we have to depend upon the fish dealers in New Westminster to supply the whole trade of the city as well as far east as Winnipeg, and we were entirely in their hands. You see the first of the fish that are caught will certainly be shipped out of the country, and that leaves us with very high prices, and then to take such fish as will not be required for shipment—that is you may say the culled fish, and we can take it or leave it.

Q. And then the best fish are shipped out of the country, and the worst left for local market!—A. Yes, always.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. Were there no licenses here at all!—A. None: there has never been any.

Q. What was the reason!—A. Well, the reason was, as far as I could find out from Mr. Mowat, if one license was issued he would have to issue licenses to every fresh fish man in the city and that would use up all the licenses.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. And do I understand you never had one license!—A. Not one—we never had one license.

Mr. WILMOT :—Did you understand how they stood in Victoria!

Mr. HIGGINS :—Well, I thought there was one.

Mr. WILMOT :—Mr. Inspector McNabb, can you give us information—has any licenses been issued in Victoria and Vancouver?

Mr. McNABB :—There were several individual fishermen from Vancouver who had licenses to fish on the Fraser River, but they sold their fish to canners on the Fraser River—they fished on the Fraser River, and I presume had licenses.

Mr. WINCH :—Angus McInnes moved over here—I know one had a saloon here—I was selling about four tons of fresh fish a week and I could not get any.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. It seems very strange that in a large city like this there should be no licenses!—A. It is very serious indeed.

Q. One of the objects of the Commission is to investigate such matters, and you see the recommendation has been made that interim licenses be issued!—A. Well, I had the contract for supplying the Canadian Pacific Railway and the steamers, and they require a large supply before they sail, but we had difficulty in getting fish.

## Marine and Fisheries.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. I think there is no difference of opinion among the Commissioners about the senseless way in which these licenses have been managed, when I see good British subjects coming up in Westminster and stating they could not get a license and yet others got them and sold them!—A. Well, I have three boats tied up, and I can tell you I intended to work them whether I was fined or not.

*By Mr. Wilmut :*

Q. Well, but Mr. Winch let me tell you that these interim licenses will not make any difference with any licenses that may come out afterwards, but to make provision for this fish trade, etc., these licenses are issued, and it will not result that if a man has one now he will not necessarily be entitled to another!—A. Will freezers be allowed to increase their number?

Q. Well, that is a matter to be considered again!—A. You see—here I deal in fish and sell it out in pounds. I handle more fresh fish than any man in British Columbia—that is actually in connection with the retail trade in the cities of Victoria, Vancouver and Westminster, I will handle more fish than any other man. I employ seven men here, and they are all married men, and from what I read in the papers, I think I employ as many as the canneries in that regard—then I employ men in the deep-sea fisheries too.

Q. What markets do you sell your deep sea fish in!—A. Well, I have not sold much fresh salmon except in the immediate city—then we have shipped as far east as Winnipeg and to small towns along the line, but it has been so difficult to get fish that we could not send much to those places.

Q. But you never had any license before!—A. I never had any.

Q. Well, without putting it too low or correspondingly too high, how many licenses would suit your trade!—A. Five would suit for the city trade to give me sufficient quantity of fish for our own use in the city.

Q. Would your own men fish those five licenses!—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Because a system has prevailed that persons getting licenses would farm them out, and I think my brother Commissioners are dead against that altogether?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh, yes.

Mr. WINCH.—Well, any time I have not my boats at Westminster and the fish do not come in to supply the wants of the people of British Columbia, those licenses can be taken away from me.

Mr. HIGGINS.—That is fair—that is right.

*By Mr. Wilmut :*

Q. Yes, that is fair, but the system has prevailed and licenses given to parties have got into the canneries' hands and have been farmed out!—A. I don't know anything about the canners, but I wish to get enough licenses to supply my trade.

Q. The whole object of the Commission is to investigate these matters!—A. Well, I started in with the city—I came in just after the fire, and it has been a very difficult thing to get fish to supply the city—you see in the season every boat is turned into the canneries and we cannot get fish for our trade.

Q. Is it spring salmon or sockeye!—A. Spring salmon, people want fresh fish here in season, and as regards the hatchery, why should you hatch only sockeye fish?

Q. Well, when the hatchery was first started it was intended to only hatch the spring salmon or "quinnat," but it would appear that the "quinnat" was not the commercial fish of the Fraser River and the department took the information given them by the canners and others, that the only commercial fish here was the sockeye, and so the department took the sockeye for breeding purposes!—A. Well, I don't use it in my fresh fish trade here.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. What do you think of the "quinnat"!—A. Well, we would want the spring salmon for our trade, and you see that is why we come in contact with the others.

Q. Is it a fine fish!—A. Oh yes, it is a fine fish.

*By Mr. Wilnot :*

Q. Are you from the eastern provinces?—A. I am from Ontario—Cobourg.

Q. Then you have no experience of the salmon in the eastern provinces?—A. No, sir, you say licenses should go to only British subjects!

Well, you see there are men working here—seining for black cod-fish—and I take all their fish—and then two other men—I take all their fish, besides other men I have constant in my employ, and then I will have to have other men in Westminster, and you see the quantity of men I will have to have to handle these fish. Now there is another man here who fishes for smelt and herring in winter time; but not in summer time—he is barred from fishing in the river and it comes hard upon them if only British subjects are allowed, but it would be better than to let in the Americans.

Q. But if they have been here long they should be British subjects—you see one great complaint has been made that many outsiders come in and fish!—A. Oh yes, that is right.

Mr. WILNOT.—I may say it is the unanimous opinion of the Commission that none but British subjects should get licenses.

*By Mr. Armstrong :*

Q. You catch any other fishes but smelt?—A. Flounders, halibut.

Q. Do you catch any flounders here?—A. Yes, we catch them in boats with seines.

Q. Any halibut?—A. Yes, some in the bay, the large quantities though are caught farther north.

*By Mr. Wilnot :*

Q. Are you identified with the company that are catching halibut and shipping them east?—A. In a certain way, I bought their fish and shipped them east.

Q. Has it been profitable so far?—A. Well it is this way, we have no markets, we have the fish and means of catching them, but we have no markets—they don't use much halibut in the east.

Q. What do you mean by "east"?—A. Well, in Montreal for instance, a ton of halibut would glut the market, then in Boston and eastern American cities we have the Atlantic halibut there before us. Then, again, we have many disadvantages in the ways of shipping—if we want to send halibut to Chicago it has actually to go round by way of Boston.

Q. And do you have to send halibut to Boston to sell in Chicago?—A. Yes, I believe there is a large company in Boston that control the whole trade.

Q. The British Columbia fishermen are virtually controlled by Boston dealers?—A. Yes, but I think they will make room for us in time, I think we will manage to get a foot-hold soon.

Q. Then the evidence so far is that a fair and large trade can be cultivated with regard to halibut fishing here?—A. Oh, yes; it is sure to come; we need a little protection and sympathy to help us along.

Q. What duty do you pay on halibut going to Boston?—A. One cent a pound.

Q. Has the representation been made that if fish was coming in as American fish they will go in duty free?—A. I have not heard of that.

Q. It is practised in Ontario; fish sent in as American fish go in duty free; a Canadian fisherman will sell his nets nominally to the Americans and then the fish goes in as American fish?—A. Yes; well, I think before the next November or December comes along we will find a great many of the fishermen from the eastern provinces out here catching the fish and sending them to the States, and it will need a good deal of protection; this halibut fishery is just beginning, and it will not do to let it run like the salmon fishery.

Q. Now, you have told us about the halibut; have you shipped any black cod?—A. Well, there are some in the market; we catch the skil; we catch black cod here; it is different to Atlantic cod; it is a different fish from the skil that comes in.

Q. Are they smaller?—A. Oh, the cod-fish we catch up here by hand lines, and it will weigh from 60 to 70 pounds.



## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. And the skil!—A. From four to nine pounds; it is a smaller fish; it has a flat head, very round, and the meat is pure white, very white; I will get some and show you.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Where are they caught!—A. Not here; I cannot give you the proper location, but I believe it is 300 or 400 miles this side of the boundary.

Q. Queen Charlotte Islands!—A. Yes, about there.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Are fish sent over the American boundary!—A. I don't know; I have shipped it to Toronto and Quebec; but they have no skil there; now the fish is well thought of; many of my customers here think a great deal of the fish.

Q. It was represented to us at Nanaimo that cod or skil would not dry as well as the Atlantic fish: they cannot dry them for the foreign market.—A. No; they cannot be dried, but they can be pickled in salt very well.

Q. Then black cod or skil is a much more edible fish than the Atlantic fish!—A. Well, I don't know anything about the Atlantic fisheries; only I know they are selling just as well as Georgia-boned cod-fish.

Q. Then the ling: the ling is what you call your cod here!—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You see these local names confuse them as to market values, etc.; you have skil, black cod and ling: are they distinct kinds of fish!—A. Well, I think ling and black cod fish are same kinds of fish. Mr. Ladner, do you know anything about it!

Mr. WILMOT.—Mr. Inspector McNabb might know something about it.

Mr. McNABB.—The true cod does not exist in British Columbia waters, but the ling are very much like the Atlantic ling.

Mr. WILMOT.—But the Atlantic ling are quite distinct from the Atlantic cod.

Mr. McNABB.—Oh, yes; quite distinct and the cod are quite different to the ling.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, the object of asking these questions is to get information about these fish.—A. Well, the ling and the cod-fish are one and the same fish as far as I can find out from all fishermen.

Mr. McNABB.—Oh no; if you see a ling and a cod fish alongside of each other you would see the difference—the fins, etc., are quite different.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. The ling with us are more of the style of an eel—they have a continuous row of fins right to the tail!—A. Well, that is the kind we catch here.

Q. And the codfish—has not that continuous kind of fin!—A. I have not handled any of them like that.

Q. And you think it is not advisable that licenses should be made transferable at all!—A. No sir; I would not think so.

Q. You asked the reason some little time ago why sockeye was bred at the hatchery instead of "quinnat"—can you give us any information from your own knowledge as to the benefit derived from the hatchery!—A. No; none at all.

Q. You say men who fish with you fish with seines!—A. Yes; right out in the harbour—there are some of the fishermen here who will give evidence that they fish with the seine.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. We are much obliged to you for the information you have given us.—A. With regard to the quantities of licenses—two licenses will be of very little benefit.

Q. But, they will be better than none—will they not!—A. Yes sir; but if any considerable time between now and when the licenses would be issued it will be of very little benefit.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. You can purchase from others who have them!—A. No, that would not do either—oh, you mean to buy fish from them!

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes; it is just for the present—it may be a few days or a month before the others are issued.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I wish a subpoena issued for Mr. Allan, a hotel-keeper here—I wish to find out about the licenses he had.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, yes.

The secretary was then directed to make out a subpoena calling upon Mr. Allan to be present before the Commission at 2 p.m.

JOHN KELLY, a native of Newfoundland,—for two years in British Columbia, describing himself as of no particular occupation, though bred a fisherman, a resident of Vancouver, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Well sir, what have you got to say—what do you come before this Commission for?—A. Well sir, I will tell you the truth—I am on my oath. I have been handled very badly since I came here—we bought twine and made nets—we bought enough to run nets out to the lighthouse there and we have never wet it yet—we spent all the money we had and are now nearly done up.

Q. How are you done up?—A. Well, I had to get a house and the wind blows into it in the fall and the boys are working at it there—I have three sons of my own.

Q. But why could you not use this twine?—A. I could not get a license.

Q. Why?—A. The cannerymen had them all—they had all the licenses.

Q. Then do I understand you there was no licenses because all were taken up?—A. There were no licenses for me—I could not get employed at all.

Q. Then you could not get a license and you feel aggrieved at that?—A. Yes; I could not get one nor my boys either.

Q. Anything else?—A. Well, there was a cousin of mine came here and he brought his twine with him and he left too; he could not use them; he could not get license. It ruined him anyway.

Q. Do you know of other persons getting licenses since you applied?—A. I don't know of anything except myself.

Q. Did you tender money, too?—A. Yes; one year it was \$5, and last year it was \$20.

Q. Were you willing to pay \$20?—A. Yes; I know nothing else to do, except work on the water.

Q. Have you anything else to say?—A. No; sir.

Q. And in Nova Scotia, did you fish there?—A. No; not Nova Scotia. I don't belong to Nova Scotia. I come from a better country than Nova Scotia. (Laughter.) I come from Newfoundland.

Q. And don't you think this a better country?—A. No; I don't. My friends have gone back.

Q. And what kind of fish did you fish in Newfoundland?—A. Well, all kinds, sir.

Q. And what kinds do you fish for?—A. Oh, well I fished for soles and bad heads and all sorts.

Q. Well, you might fish for soles here?—A. Well, perhaps so.

Q. You would not want a license to fish for soles here; what others did you get?—A. Oh, capelin and cod and all kinds. Now, I am able to tell you just what you asked this man who was here.

Q. You think the cod the same as you catch in Newfoundland?—A. Yes; just the same. Then at home we catch black cod, but here the oil is in the liver.

Q. You have seen the cod that is caught here?—A. I have seen almost all of them. I have caught capelin, that is bait for the fish.

Q. Well, then, you think the cod is the same here, except one has oil in its body while the other has oil in its liver?—A. Yes, sir; that is straight.

Q. And what do you think of ling?—A. Well, I have not caught many of them. I am a stranger out here, but after a while I will catch all of them.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. Have you caught halibut?—A. No, sir. I have caught them on the banks.

Q. Then you think the main grievance is that you have come here and you cannot fish?—A. Yes, sir; and would you not think it a grievance after coming here and buying a house and fetching twine here, etc.?

Q. Well, sir, I hope you can do better?—A. And all my boys too, sir. I tell you gentlemen it is a shame: here are Italians and Chinese and all sorts at work fishing, and good Englishmen and British subjects on their own soil cannot get a license; that is what England does everywhere; she gets new countries for people to go to after hard fighting and work, and then very fine Englishmen and Irishmen go around and cannot get anything to do. Is that right, sir; is that the proper thing in our own country? (Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN.—Order, order, please.

Q. Then you think Italians and others are not as good as Englishmen?—A. (emphatically) No, sir; I know they are not. I have been in their countries; I know them; many a blow have I put over their heads. (Laughter.) Oh, I have been among them; why in Sicily once two of us licked about a dozen of them; pshaw, a good sturdy Englishman or Irishman is worth a half a dozen of them any day. (Laughter.)

Q. Who did you apply to for license?—A. Mr. Oppenheimer was one; then the inspector. He told me there was no licenses—the cannerymen had them all.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. What did he tell you?—A. Oh, one thing and another; but he didn't ask me questions like this gentleman has been doing, like a gentleman should. I understood the canneries had them all.

Q. But you would be interested to know that the records don't show that cannerymen got all?—A. Well, I don't know. We want to get licenses, if possible, and if we get them the money won't go home to Italy, or it won't go to China either, as such a lot of it does now to the shame and disgrace of the country, while our own people can do nothing. I do hope you gentlemen will remedy the matter. I have three boys, and we are all fishermen and have our twine, etc., and we are not fitted for much of any other calling. It is really very hard that we cannot get licenses.

Mr. WILMOY.—Well, sir, your complaint is recorded. That will do.

---

A. W. WRIGHT, a native of Canada, six years in British Columbia, a fish-dealer, and resident of Vancouver, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Now, Mr. Wright, will you submit your views or complaints to the Commission—whatever you may have to say?—A. Well, the first subject I would like to mention is that I represent the British Columbia Fishing and Trading Company, of Vancouver, as secretary-treasurer.

Q. Well, sir?—A. The first thing I would like to mention are licenses. Last year we applied for licenses, but we were not furnished. This year we applied for ten licenses. We have large orders for salmon from eastern Canada and the United States, and we are not able to fill them.

Q. For what reason?—A. Well, no licenses are issued yet.

Q. And you cannot supply your customers for want of licenses, is that it, sir?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you been engaged in work before last year?—A. This company has been organized about six months, and Fader Brothers carried on the business before that. I am only speaking of my business for this year—practically the same company applied for licenses last year. If any provision can be made in the meantime, the same as for Mr. Winch, I would very much like to have it done.

Q. Well, I simply read the letter from the department to the inspector authorizing him to issue interim licenses.—A. Of course, shipping in car-loads as we do, two licenses would be of very little use to us.

Q. It is a question if you want licenses at all for halibut?—A. Yes; but I am speaking of salmon. These men won't carry up two or three salmon, and it would be very difficult to gather fish up.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. But if fishermen got licenses, could you not get fish from them?—A. Well, but then we are at a disadvantage when Mr. Winch and Mr. Port get licenses.

Q. Oh, but you are not—they have no licenses now.

Mr. WILMOT.—No. You are all on the same footing for this year.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Did Fader Brothers have licenses last year?—A. They never had licenses.

Q. Were there ever any licenses issued for Vancouver?—A. No; not at all. There has never been any that I know of.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Have you any knowledge of this halibut trade?—A. Yes, I have.

Q. Is this company identified with catching the fish lately and shipping them?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Has your success in catching them been very satisfactory?—Yes, the halibut is very plenty.

Q. And do they take in eastern markets as well as the eastern halibut?—A. Yes, our representative, Mr. Grant, who has just returned, tells us they take better in some places than eastern halibut—the trouble is chiefly that we cannot get express service.

Q. Have the profits been remunerative?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. And then it looks to become a very profitable business?—A. Yes.

Q. And if you can do business with Chicago and other western cities it will be still more remunerative?—A. Yes, we propose establishing an agency at Winnipeg.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. If you cannot get a license would it be remunerative?—A. Well, if there were no licenses given there would be no salmon caught I suppose.

Q. You speak of salmon?—A. Yes.

Q. And you would have to buy from others?—A. Yes, some one would have to have licenses.

Q. And if you had to buy them it would place you at a serious disadvantage would it not?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are these halibut caught out far from the coast? These supplies that you have obtained were they out any distance on banks?—A. No, sir; I have been up several times to the fishing grounds—we find during the summer season halibut come down very close, and as soon as the cold season comes they go up north almost to the Alaskan Boundary—you will find them there very plentiful.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. You have our Canadian fish at the Boundary then?—A. Well, they are certainly very loyal—they wait for us to catch them. (Laughter.)

Q. And would the fishing be outside—off some distance from the coast?—A. Well, no; our fishing is mostly within the three mile limit.

Q. My object in asking you this is to find out where fishing is done, because I do not think it is necessary for you to get a license for deep-sea fishing, though I am not quite prepared to say exactly—I think in the inlets and bays licenses are necessary, but not in outside waters?—A. There is one matter I would like to say. We used a beam trawl like what is used off the English coast and in trawling off the coast here for halibut or any fish we may take in, we may take young salmon. Well, how would that effect us—we don't need a license for it but if we take salmon?

Q. Do you use a long beam trawl?—A. Yes, about 40 feet.

Q. It sweeps along the bottom and takes in everything?—A. Yes, sir.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. The opinion is in England and other countries that this trawl is very destructive because it takes in everything along the bottom, and destroys vast quantities of young and immature fish?—A. Well, it is not necessary to kill the small fish—the fish all come up alive that I have noticed in the net, and the small ones not used for commercial purposes are thrown overboard.

Q. Well, that is at present, no doubt, because the commercial needs for fish are somewhat limited?—A. Well, perhaps—we use the same trawl.

Q. What size of meshes in the bag?—A. The meshes decrease towards the bag. I think they would be  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches extension.  $1\frac{1}{4}$  inch square.

Q. Well, now, what sort of fish do you catch in this trawl?—A. Well, soles, and flounders, and halibut.

Q. Have you soles here, the true sole?—A. Yes, sir; we have got brill, too.

Q. Do you catch soles with the others?—A. Yes; brill is caught occasionally with halibut and flounders, dog-fish, etc.

Q. What is the average size of soles you catch?—A. Well, from 4 inches long to about 8 inches.

Q. They are pretty broad, are they not?—A. Yes, sir; they are rather broader than long.

Q. And brill?—A. They are larger again; 14 to 16 inches long.

Q. And cod are larger yet?—A. Yes.

Q. And salmon, what size would you catch?—A. Oh, any salmon that might be in the water.

Q. Adult fish or would they be young?—A. Oh, no; adult fish.

Q. Any herring?—A. No.

Q. Flounders?—A. About 12 to 14 inches long.

Q. My desire in asking you is that there is a desire on the part of the Government to protect the young fish so they may grow to marketable size and be useful. And where are these shipped to?—A. To the North-west and other places.

Q. Then you are one who does not think Canada is a foreign country?—A. Oh, no; we have shipped considerable to the United States, Boston and New York. About taking the small fish; I have never seen the small fish; I do not think the breeding grounds are in shore; we have done our fishing in deep waters and I have never seen the young fish in those waters.—A. No; the breeding grounds are in rivers and apparently they do not stay in those waters.

Q. No; but you see there would be small brill and soles and flounders, etc., in the neighbourhood of where you catch the big ones?—A. No; not necessarily. Now we never see small halibut. We catch all sizes of big ones, but the breeding grounds seem to be outside.

Q. But would not the little ones be on rough bottom?—A. No; we cannot get fish on rough bottom.

Q. But on a gravelly bottom with stones like this (ink-bottle), the young of flounders will run right into the gravel and soon be out of the way?—A. Well, a trawl would take a stone like that in. We fish on sandy bottom and have never seen small ones.

Q. Then you think the halibut fishery will become very important to British Columbia?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What size of sole did you say you take?—A. Well, about 10 inches. We hardly think it right that we should not have any licenses in Vancouver. New Westminster seems to get the whole of them.

Q. The trouble lies here, with a large number of canning establishments and then parties like yourself all getting licenses, query: would it not be too many for the river? The trouble is to fix it so the river will not be over-fished.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Do you not think that would arrange itself?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, yes; it might be a "survival of the fittest."

Mr. WRIGHT.—Well, we think we should be encouraged; we have invested a large amount of money in the business.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, yes; I merely throw this out to see if you think it can be overdone; you see if there are so many getting licenses here and so many in Westminster, and so many canning establishments all getting licenses, it might over-fish the river; the object is not to do this if possible.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But would people catch fish if they could not sell them?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, we have found that great quantities were caught and then thrown away.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; but I think it would fix itself; it is debarring people from getting licenses that gives all the trouble.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Have you anything else, sir, you wish to say?—A. No, sir.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—We are much obliged to you, sir, for your information; it has been very interesting.

JOHN INGLEHART, a native of Quebec, four years in British Columbia, a fisherman, and resident of Vancouver, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Well, sir, what have you to represent?—A. Well, I heard that last man say they were not able to buy fish from the fishermen; I fished last fall; I got a license and I came last fall to sell my fish, but they would not buy my fish; I saw lots of Indians there selling fish and I could not sell my fish, but had to go around town and sell them as best I could.

Q. Well, where were the supply of fish these people obtained; where did they get them?—A. Well, I think they got them from Indians; I see lots of Indians come here and they have no licenses and they sell their fish.

Q. And you think if Indians sold fish without licenses you labour under disadvantages?—A. Yes.

Q. What net do you fish with?—A. I fish with sockeye net, a drift net.

Q. Where do you fish?—A. Right around here in the harbour.

Q. What do you catch principally?—A. Sockeye and dog-fish sometimes.

Q. And cod-fish?—A. I only caught two cod-fish in my net.

Q. And spring salmon?—A. No; not here.

Q. Where do you catch those?—A. I catch some spring salmon in the Fraser River; I had a license for there, too.

Q. Are sockeye numerous here; do you catch them in any numbers here?—A. Well, I was not fishing much here; I fished in the Fraser River and afterwards came here.

Q. And you complain that other persons who did not take licenses had the advantage of you in selling fish to this market, or to the persons here?—A. Yes; I wrote myself to Mr. Mowat to come and stop that, as we were not allowed to sell our fish; it was a shame to rob the Government in that way.

Q. You wrote to have people stopped who were fishing without a license?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you have license last year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You have had licenses since you were in this country?—A. The first year I fished for Mr. Munn; he was in Westminster; I went to Mr. Mowat, but he says, "all the licenses are given away." "Well," I says, "I must have one, I am still a fisherman; I commenced to fish when ten years old." I wrote to Ottawa about it, but it was too late, and he told me to go to Mr. Mowat, and next year I had a license.

Q. What year was that?—A. The year before last; I fished for Mr. Ewen.

Q. What was the quantity of sockeye you caught last year and the year before?—A. Last year I caught about 4,000.

Q. And what did you get for them?—A. Ten cents a piece.

Q. And what was the usual weight?—A. The sockeye about 4, 5 and 6 pounds.

Q. Did you ever catch any as high as 8 or 9 pounds?—A. Well, I never remember I never weighed them either.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. Do they make any difference in the weight of fish in buying them?—A. No, suppose it is 20 pounds, you would get just the same.

Q. What part of the river did you fish in?—A. Oh, all along the river, in spring 4 miles below Westminster, and when sockeye came in, I went to fish at the mouth of the river.

Q. On the sand banks?—A. Yes sir.

Q. And are the boats very numerous?—A. Yes, and I will tell you something, I swore to tell the truth, I was here 3 years ago, and I fished for Mr. Muun, and every one had a license, and they set their nets right on top of us, there was 200 and 300 fathoms of net.

Q. And then the 150 fathoms was not stuck to?—A. Well, I don't know, the law was not in force for that then.

Q. Do you think it injurious to have a continuous string of nets running down there?—A. Well, I don't know.

Q. Have you any nets there with wings?—A. Well, I think 150 fathoms net is long enough.

Q. What meshes deep are they?—A. 45 at the mouth of the river and 35 and 30.

Q. Have they ever been troubled with offal in the river much?—A. Well, yes, last year I went down from Mr. Ewen's cannery, and the first time there was an Italian, he put his net about 20 yards from me, I saw nothing at all that time, then when I went down to lower end of my drift I hauled up my net and he came behind me and I set my net across and he came again and he put his net about 40 yards from me, and I said that is not the way to fish, you break the Government's law.

Q. Oh yes, you mean to say the nets are too close together, but do you ever get offal in your net?—A. Yes, I got 5 or 6 last year, only 5 or 6 heads.

Q. What effect on the river has the offal?—A. Oh, I don't think it hurts it much.

Q. What effect in creating sickness on the river?—A. Oh, I was there for years and I drank the water.

Q. And did it affect you at all?—A. No, sir.

Q. What about the close season on that river, I mean from 6 o'clock Saturday night to 6 o'clock Sunday evening, do you think the whole of Sunday should be kept as against fishing or not?—A. Well, I don't know.

Q. Do you fish on Sunday yourself?—A. No, I never do that, even when I might fish, I never worked on Sunday since I commenced.

Q. And a man who fishes on Sunday and you don't, has he any advantage over you?—A. Well, I never see any fishing until 6 o'clock Sunday evening.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well, thank you sir, that will do.

Dr. Duncan Bell-Irving, M.D., a native of Scotland, a resident and practising physician in Vancouver since 1883, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Now, sir, have you anything to present to this Commission?—A. Well, I was asked to state what I knew about the typhoid fever on Lulu Island and Sea Island. I have treated a large number of cases since my arrival here, especially in the last year, but there have been always cases there. I have noticed that out-breaks on the Delta land are the same as we have here in Vancouver, the same causes that produce it here produce it down there, and from observations I have made I have come to the conclusion that the water of the Fraser River has not so much to do with it as the surface water they use and the general state of farm buildings, etc. I have frequently noticed the well will be in the front yard and the privy and cess-pool not 20 or 30 yards away and as the water rises with the rise and fall of the tide, it really don't make much difference whether they take the water out of the well or from the cess-pool.

Q. Then they are not persons of taste? (Laughter).—A. Well, I would not say the water would not taste better, but it requires such a small quantity of the poison to cause the fever that it would not make much difference. I have noticed also that the

outbreaks of fever seldom correspond with the salmon fishing time; there has really been more sickness there after the fishing is done in October and December, and the last case I treated there was just before Christmas time, and I cannot conceive that the offal has had any effect in bringing about this late case. We had precisely the same experience in Vancouver here, before the water works started it was all over the city, but since then it is confined to the outskirts of the city where the water is confined to wells and cess-pools, and I think it would be better to drink water from the river than from the surface cess-pools and wells. I have frequently told the farmers down there that they should not drink the surface water and they should have tanks. It is the same way in all flat lands—if you cannot get wells below the surface it would be better to use the rain water kept in tanks. Then the numerous numbers of dead salmon I have seen on the banks up the river will do much more harm than the offal that is dumped into the fresh water, because the sun and heat has undoubtedly something to do with the formation of this poison.

Q. Have you anything further to submit?—A. I think that is all.

Q. Then your general impression is to say the offal is not injurious?—A. I would not say it improves the water, but I don't think it causes sickness.

Q. You have been treating patients in Lulu Island and Sea Island, when was the principal time?—A. I would think in November and December, but there are cases all the year round.

Q. Would decomposing vegetable matter be as injurious as animal matter?—A. Oh, yes; but it takes a long time.

Q. The fishing goes on in July, does it not?—A. Yes.

Q. And the offal is thrown in; how long would it take to decompose?—A. Oh, but a few days.

Q. And fishing ends about the end of August?—A. I don't know about that.

Q. If this offal lodges in bays and sloughs would it not decompose there?—A. Undoubtedly it would.

Q. Would it not throw off deleterious matter?—A. Oh, yes it would.

Q. And you think that has no effect upon health?—A. I am not prepared to say it has, but I think if not a bit of salmon were thrown into the Fraser River—I think the people would be just as bad because it is almost impossible to get good water there.

Q. How long have you been practising there?—A. I came to the country in 1883, and have been practising on and off since then.

Q. And you have had many cases of typhoid fever?—A. Yes; many of them; more last year; in fact some of them are not over yet.

Q. And you think drinking water from the river would be better?—A. Yes; I think it would be much better. I think the sewage and matter from these cess-pools is really the cause of the typhoid fever.

Q. And it is not added to by the offal that is thrown in?—A. I think it would be just as bad if no salmon were thrown in at all.

Q. I suppose you know the old adage, "that doctors differ and patients die!"—A. Yes, I know.

Q. And suppose other doctors gave a different opinion?—A. Well, it would not alter my opinion.

Q. And you think taking water from the deeper portion of the river would be better than from shallow waters?—A. Yes.

Q. And if this deep water is impregnated with poisons, would it not be bad?—A. Yes; I would not care to drink it myself; I told these people time and time again that they will have to make tanks and collect rain water from their sheds.

Q. Some of the doctors say put a little whiskey in it; do you think the same?—A. Well, it would take a great deal of whiskey to put in it. There is nothing peculiar about this; I have seen the same thing in many flat countries; I have been in Demarara and Holland, and it is all the same, and there are no salmon there.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. You say you would think the water would be better to drink than the surface water?—A. Yes; I would rather drink it but not from sloughs.



## Marine and Fisheries.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Then you think offal has an effect on the water of the river!—A. Well, I consider the dead fish much worse.

Q. But you say fresh offal thrown in would decompose in a day or two!—A. Yes; but the body of water is so great.

Q. But these dead fish up river would not effect it by floating up there and not down below!—A. Well, perhaps; what I said was that offal dumped in the water would not be as bad as dead fish decaying and floating down in such great numbers.

Q. But if offal is added to those dead fish, would it not make it worse!—A. Well,——

Q. Does the use of foul waters produce dysentery!—A. Oh, there is no doubt of that.

Q. Then if persons have dysentery in that neighbourhood would you say it was brought about by foul water!—A. Well, I would say it was one of the commonest causes for dysentery; but I have examined the water from many of the wells on the island and "impure" is no word for it.

Q. And are we to infer that they prefer drinking that water there, whereas the water along the shore of the river is better!—A. Well, they cannot get any other kind; they live some little way from the shores, but it is not peculiar to Lulu Island; it is the same up here.

Q. But would this impure water permeate through the soils!—A. Yes; I have no doubt it would.

Q. Then the wells would be impregnated from these impurities!—A. Yes; there is no doubt it would; these impurities from the sub-soils filter through.

Q. You see, Dr. Bell-Irving, that when residents of a community petition against this matter it is the duty of the Government to find out all about the causes of these sicknesses.—A. Yes; but I do not think it is the offal; if a net was stretched across the Fraser River and all the fish caught in it dumped there, I do not think it would be any worse. This is no opinion got up for the occasion; I have held these views for a long time. I believe typhoid fever there is produced from the same causes as in Vancouver and all other parts of the world, viz: sewage and cess-pools; they are responsible for nine-tenths of all the typhoid fever the world over.

Mr. WILNOT.—Thank you, sir.

WILLIAM CAMPBELL, a native of Scotland, three years in British Columbia, a fisherman, and resident of Vancouver, was duly sworn.

WITNESS.—Well, I have applied three years now for a license and could not get one.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Licenses to fish where!—A. On the Fraser River.

Q. Was any particular cause given why!—A. Well, they say everybody that went there and put in an application called themselves a fisherman and the licenses were all given out and there was none left for me.

Q. Were you a fisherman in Scotland!—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What inducement brought you to this country!—A. Well, I came to this country with the intention of fishing.

Q. Did you come to this immediate neighbourhood for that purpose!—A. Yes sir.

Q. And you found you could not fish without a license!—A. No sir.

Q. And did you fish for other people without a license of your own!—A. Yes, sir; I was fishing for Mr. Munn.

Q. And you think it a hardship as a British subject that you cannot get license to fish!—A. I do.

Q. Do you know of other persons getting licenses after you applied!—A. I could not say—I applied soon enough.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. On what terms did you fish?—A. I was hired by the piece—six and a half cents a fish.

Q. With another man with you?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did he get six and a half cents?—A. No it was six and a half cents for two of us.

*By Mr. Wilmet:*

Q. Which included boat and net?—A. The boat was our own but not the net.

Q. So for the use of the boat you two men got six and a half cents for the fish?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Was that the current price for fish on the river?—A. I think some got eight cents.

Q. Did any get twenty cents?—A. As far as I can understand, some who had licenses of their own got twenty cents.

Q. And you would expect to get more if you had licenses of your own?—A. I would expect to get twenty cents.

Q. Have you made any calculation of the fish you caught?—Yes; last year was a small year and we caught over four thousand fish.

Q. Do you know of more fish being caught than could be well got rid of at the canneries?—A. Well, we skip one or two days when we don't fish at all.

Q. What is the usual size of salmon you catch?—A. From six to eight pounds.

Q. Are you aware of any quantities of fish being thrown away because they cannot be used?—A. Not last year.

Q. Any year?—A. Yes; I think they were the year before.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. But do you see any one throw them away from off wharves or from the camps?—A. Well I don't see that.

Q. Then you don't know?—A. We can only take what you see yourself.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Do you own your net you fish with?—A. No sir; I got it from the canneries.

Q. Do you own your boat?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was the boat worth?—A. \$40.

Q. Did you build it yourself?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did the cannery charge you anything for lending you the net?—A. Well that was according to the price I got for the fish.

*By Mr. Wilmet:*

Q. Then if you owned the net you would get more for your fish?—A. Yes.

Q. What is the price of a net?—A. Well I think we could get one like we fished with for \$100.

Q. Where did you fish?—A. At Sea Island.

Q. And were the boats wide apart?—A. Well, I think there were enough boats fishing there last year.

Q. Was any restriction made to leave a certain portion of the river open or was it fished all over?—A. It was fished all over as far as I could see.

Q. What is your idea of the effect of oil thrown in the river?—A. Well, I don't know that it made any difference to the fish.

Q. Any to your nets?—A. It does, I believe—the oil gets on and runs them.

Q. What effect has it on the human family in drinking water?—A. Well, I think it is not very good, and I hear everybody complain.

Q. Do you drink it yourself?—A. Yes, but not if I can get anything else.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Do you feel any effects from it?—A. No.

## Marine and Fisheries

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Did you filter the water or take it from the river?—A. We drink it from the river.

Q. Do you get from above the cannery or below?—A. From above.

Q. Why?—A. Because it is better water.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Do you think decayed fish is worse than offal?—A. Well, I think fish thrown in would rot about the same.

Q. I mean the dead fish that float down?—A. Oh, I think they would be about the same.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. The dead fish that you see—do you think they were thrown in from the canneries or came down from the upper waters?—A. I thought they were fish that fell out of the nets.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Don't you think that the dead fish would not hold together to come down the river? We have evidence that live fish hardly hold together to go up?—A. No, I think they would hardly hold together to come down.

Q. Have you ever got any offal in your nets?—A. Yes, quite a few.

Q. What do you mean by a "few"?—A. Four or five in an hour.

Q. What do you do with them?—A. Oh, we take them out.

Q. And the only effect it has is to rot the nets?—A. Yes.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Have you seen any offal along the sloughs and banks?—A. No, I think everything that goes in is taken right out.

Q. Any in the sloughs or bays?—A. No, I have never seen any.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Have you seen the Sand Heads bare?—A. Yes.

Q. Any offal there?—A. I have never seen any.

Q. Have you been out in Oulachan run?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you seen them in any large quantities under the canneries?—A. No, I cannot say I have seen them.

Q. Do you know of any coming to this country like yourself with intentions to fish?—A. Yes, I know of four others but they have gone back home.

Q. Because they could not get licenses to fish?—A. Yes.

Q. If they had got licenses would they remain do you think?—A. Yes, I think they would.

Q. Then not getting licenses has prevented settlers from coming here?—A. Yes, I think it has for fishermen.

Q. What is the occupation of persons who have licenses in the other part of the year?—A. He could pursue his fishing in some other way—he could go halibut fishing, or seining, or some other way.

Mr. WILNOT.—Thank you, sir.

The Commission adjourned at 12.30 P.M., to meet again at 2 P.M., at the same place

VANCOUVER, March 12th, 1892.

### *Afternoon Session.*

The Commission was convened at 2 p.m., in the Court House.

Present:—Mr. S. Wilnot in the Chair; Mr. Sheriff Armstrong and Hon. D. W. Higgins, with Mr. Secretary Winter.

Mr. NICHOL ALLEN, a native of Scotland, nine years in British Columbia, a resident, and hotel-keeper in Vancouver, was duly sworn.

Mr. WILMOT.—What have you to lay before the Commission?

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Are you engaged in fishing?—A. I have a license for fishing, I have had it for two years.

Q. To fish where?—A. On the Fraser River.

Q. Did you ever live on the Fraser River?—A. No.

Q. Did you ever follow fishing for a livelihood?—A. No, my intention was to follow it at the fall and I wanted to get two licenses, one for my son and one for myself. I wanted to go into the curing trade.

Q. Did your son fish?—A. No, he did not fish.

Q. Who supplied you with license?—A. I had it from Mr. Mowat.

Q. What did you tell Mr. Mowat when you went for a license?—A. Oh, I did not tell him anything. I wrote the Minister of Fisheries at Ottawa.

Q. Did you get a reply?—A. They told me they had referred it to their agent at New Westminster.

Q. Afterwards you got a license?—A. Yes.

Q. What did you pay for it?—A. \$5.

Q. What did you do with it?—A. I paid two men to fish and arranged with Mr. Todd to take the fish I would give him, and those he would not take I carried them into town and sold them.

Q. You hired two men to fish for you?—A. Yes, I gave them a percentage, I gave them one-third each, then I had a horse and cart and carried them into town.

Q. But that was two years ago?—A. Yes.

Q. And you paid them one-third each to manage matters, what would that be?—A. About \$150 each, I could not exactly tell, that was two years ago.

Q. How did you get a license for the second year?—A. I applied for it, I sent my application to Mr. Mowat and employed two men for the year and they made about the same, the cannerymen pay them, that is one-third of the fish each and I take the balance for my net and license.

Q. And that gave you how much each year?—A. Oh, I had not much last year! I made a little before last year.

Q. Did you make \$300 last year?—A. Oh no, not near that.

Q. After all expenses were paid?

Mr. AERSTRONG.—You count your boat and net as expenses?—A. Oh, yes, each year that came out of the third, (the one-third).

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. You had to supply everything?—A. Everything but the labour.

Q. You went on shares, each got one-third?—A. Yes, I had to keep up the plant in full and paid for the license.

Q. Have you applied for this year?—A. I have not yet but I expect to apply and I intend to apply for two licenses as I wish to go into the trade more fully.

Q. You are very modest, I don't think you should get any.—A. I think we should get a renewal.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Have you any idea of the probable number of fish you divided the year before last?—A. About 2,000.

Q. And last year?—A. I think they would average about 4,000—it was a small year.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Yet you did better than the year before?—A. It was on better prices.

Q. You got 15 cents last year?—A. No; last year I didn't get so much. I don't remember exactly. I got 4,800 fish or something like that.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. The first year you got 15 cents?—A. I only averaged about 9 cents the first year.

Q. A pretty good investment, don't you think, to put in \$5 and take out what you did?—A. Oh, well, I put in more than that—\$20 last year. I don't think the investment is so very great. You want a new net every year, and really there is not a great deal in it.

Q. But there is so much in it you are going to apply for two?—A. But if I had two, I could give it more attention than if I had one.

Q. Did you sell the year before on the market or sell to the cannery?—A. I sold to a cannery—the Lulu Island Canning Company. Of course, it was the first year they started, and they wanted to get all the fish they could. Last year, Mr. Todd took all.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. You are not a practical fisherman yourself?—A. No; I am not a practical fisherman or dealer in fish.

Q. Very well, sir; that is all.

---

Captain GEORGE, a native chinook Indian, of Harrison River, was duly sworn. Being unable to speak much English, the questions put to him and his answers were interpreted by Mr. P. Tiernan, Indian agent.

MR. TIERNAN.—I may say, before he commences, that fifty Indians came to me and wanted to come here before you, but I thought one would be enough to tell you all—he is a fisherman and farmer.

THE INTERPRETER.—He says that himself and others are not pleased at all.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. What at?—A. He says that the whole of the Indians only get forty licenses, and that they are very much displeased at the number they get.

Q. What is the number of their tribe?—A. His tribe is about 120 all told, but that does not cover all—the forty licenses cover all the tribes.

Q. Then their complaint is because they only get forty licenses?—A. He says the white men come here and get licenses and his people were here first. It is the same old story. The white men come and get licenses first in preference to them, and he says they should not. Many tell him the Indians come to help the fishermen. He thinks if the Indians would not help the fishermen, there would be no fishery at all.

Q. What does he mean by fishermen?—A. The cannerymen.

Q. That if not for the Indians the cannerymen would not get on with their work?—A. Yes; that is what he means. He says God gave them these waters and the fish and the land, and now it is taken away from them by new comers.

Q. You tell him that the law gives preference to them—that they can fish without licenses for their own use, but not for barter or sale, and that when they come in competition with white men, they must stand in the same position as white men, but when fishing for their own use, they can fish without licenses.—A. But I may tell you, Mr. Wilmot, that they are not allowed to fish. I know an instance where their nets were taken and cut to pieces up at Yale—a poor cripple of a man—and they have not the privileges you speak of.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Well, who did that?—A. Well, I won't tell you who did it—I know who did it, and I had to pay \$5 out of my own pocket to get twine for that poor old man.

Q. Do Indians use any other way than by drifting and spearing?—A. They don't spear at all—they only put up a few barrels for their own use.

Q. When did this occur, Mr. Tiernan, if you will not tell us the name?—A. Three years ago—it was an officer of the fisheries department.

Q. Then an officer of the law?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, I think the same law prevails here and it is intended at least that the same shall be throughout the whole Dominion, that Indians on their reserves shall fish at any time and in any manner, but they must not fish for sale or barter!—A. Well, that is just what I want to know—I wanted to know if they are allowed in any manner to catch fish for their own use; I want your opinion on that point?

Q. But if allowed to catch them for their own use they must be allowed appliances—they cannot catch them with their hands alone!—A. With nets.

Q. Well, if with nets they must be for their own use—but if they catch them and put them in the market they are the same as whitemen and must come under the same rules.—A. But they want to know if they can catch these fish and put up a few barrels of fish for their own use!

Mr. WILMOT.—Certainly they are allowed to do that—that is the intention.

Mr. TIERNAN.—Well, I know an officer was sent up last year and they took away an old man's net—an old man 70 years of age, and he has never got it back yet.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Well, I think you are bound to answer the question as to who this was—if you know it!—A. Well, I would not like to tell it.

Q. Well, there are lots of things people do not like to tell, but when on the stand they have got to tell it.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Was it Mr. Green!—A. No.

Q. Was it Mr. McDonald!—A. No.

Q. It was not Mr. Grant or McNeish!—A. Oh, no.

Q. Then these are all the fishery officers—do you know Mr. McNabb!—A. Yes.

Mr. McNABB.—No: I believe it was before my time.

Mr. WILMOT (to Mr. McNabb).—Those are all the officers I have read over!

Mr. McNABB.—Yes, at present.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. It happened at Yale!—A. Yes.

Q. Then you have to give the name, Mr. Tiernan.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. And if this man did this it is most unjust!—A. Well, it is too late now—he is in New Westminster.

Mr. McNABB.—May I be allowed to say a word?

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes.

Mr. McNABB.—Under the present act none of the officers under me was guilty of this crime our friend attributes to me, but had that occurred last year his net would have been taken away because the law demands it, because Indians are allowed to catch fish in any other way except by drifting or spearing and these are disallowed—an officer to do his duty would be obliged to do this.

A. Well, if I am compelled to say it—I am on my oath—his name was John Euie.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, under the circumstances that Mr. McNabb states, John Euie would be perfectly justified in doing this. Mr. McNabb is it your duty to instruct officers under you to seize nets that may be used by Indians in the river?

Mr. McNABB.—Just to illustrate this, I may say last year I went out myself and the old man, the Chief, had a long net and he took it in and promised not to use it again. There was a good deal of correspondence with the Indian department, and after a good deal of correspondence, I received a letter which the Minister sent to the Indian department that an officer was obliged to take these nets, as it was against the law.

A. But in any case it exceeded the law to take it and cut it.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Well, I don't know—if a net is illegally used and you simply take it away, it would be used again—the practice is to cut or burn them all over the Dominion—they

## Marine and Fisheries

are generally sold at auction and bought in by friends—the best way is by destroying them—I merely speak of the general rule!—A. Well, but the general rule should not be in force against the Indians.

Q. Yes, but the intention is to give the Indians a privilege the whitemen have not—he can fish at any time on his reserves, but if he goes in to sell or barter, why he must be on the same footing as whitemen!—A. Oh, we know that—but, Mr. McNabb what does a whiteman pay for his privilege of fishing for his own use.

*By Mr. McNabb:*

Q. \$21—A. Well, now sir; what great privilege is that—the whiteman fishes for \$2.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. But Indians fish for nothing—now what does this man (Capt. George) want!—A. He wants unlimited licenses for Indians—every Indian to get a license.

Q. Would they pay \$20!—A. Oh, I don't know.

Q. Do they work for canneries!—A. Yes, they do mostly—may I ask if \$20 will be the license fee this year!

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, that is not settled yet.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Oh, yes; it is the law now—an Indian fishes for his own use now for nothing, except they use spears or drift-nets!—A. But under that law they cannot fish unless they go in and catch fish with their hands.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. The law intends they shall have the same facilities they had before whitemen came here!—A. Well, I will tell you—before the whitemen came they had nets and now they cannot have these—why should they not be allowed to fish!

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. I must admit there is an error in some way in the regulations—the law at present says they cannot fish with drift-nets or spears, but cannot they fish with nishagans or negogs, or whatever they are called!—A. Oh, no; they do not use them here—that is for eastern Indians.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. But don't the canneries pay them well for their work!—A. Oh, well; the cannerymen always pay them whatever they promise—they treat them well.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. Well, you ask the Indian whether it is not a fact that their names are put down for a license and the canners pay for the license and use it—ask him that!—A. He says that some Indians have boats and nets of their own but not all of them and when they have not boats and nets the cannerymen—Mr. Munn and Mr. Ewen—and Mr. Laidlaw—gives them \$20 and supplies them with boat and net and when they get their money they pay them back.

Q. Then they virtually get the same privilege as whitemen and cannerymen get the advantage of boat and net!—A. Well, really I think the cannerymen do it for charity.

Q. Oh, no; for business!—A. Well, they would not give it to whitemen the same.

Q. Probably that is what he means by not doing without the Indians. The cannerymen put down the Indians' names for licenses and they get the licenses all the while!—A. But I know to my knowledge the cannerymen never put down their names without them going and working for it.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Just ask him again about the boat and net!—A. No; he says if they had no boat and net of their own, the cannery say come and we will give you a boat and net for half the profit out of the sockeye; when he has no dollars he borrows the money from the cannery.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Then the license is taken out in the Indians name, but the cannery pays the money and derives all the benefit from the license!—A. No.

Q. Ask him what he gets for his fish under this license!—A. Well, he says if they get 40 sockeye they give half to the cannery and the other half is their own.

Q. And if a hundred!—A. The same way; we give the cannery one-half and sell the other fish at usual prices.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Well, ask him if he thinks the boat and net and license would be any use if it was not for the cannery to buy his fish!

Mr. ARMSTRONG (who understood Chinook).—But you should not suggest the answer to him; let him put the answer himself: what does he say!—A. He says he could do nothing with them, but dry them and salt them.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Just ask him how many fish he caught in his boat the year before last or last year!—A. He did not catch any; I can answer for him; he was not fishing; he is a kind of constable and goes about keeping the regulations between the different tribes of Indians and he did not fish at all; that I know of my own knowledge.

Q. Where does he reside!—A. At Harrison River.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Is he a representative of all the Indians!—A. Yes; he is a Chief. There were 50 wanted to come, but he came for all; he came on their behalf.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Is there anything else!—A. He says that some persons told him in New Westminster that you (to Chairman) said the Indians were all lazy, and that they would fish for a few weeks only, and he says that is not correct and he is displeased.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Well, just tell the Indian that the man who told him that also told a falsehood; tell him Mr. Wilmot has always been an advocate of the Indian.—A. Yes; he says he does not like Mr. Wilmot to go back to Canada with that idea.

Q. Yes; and you can readily understand that parties not liking Mr. Wilmot would tell him that to prejudice him and the Indian against me.—A. Yes; he says when the Princess Louise came here she spoke to him and she told him if anything did not go right to speak to her about it and she would represent it to the Queen.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Well, but what is it he doesn't like!—A. Well, it is this: that Italians and Greeks and other whitemen come here and get all the licenses on the river.

Q. Well, you should disabuse this man's mind of that; they would do nothing with the fish if the whitemen were not here!—A. Yes; but they all work.

Q. Well, so do we all work. You see if even the Indians catch less fish than the average whiteman he gets some \$200 at least for them, and if it was not for the cannery they would get nothing at all!—A. Another grievance is one entirely among the Indians themselves. You see they only get 40 licenses and the same Indians get them all the time and of course there is much discontent among the other Indians.



## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; but that is for Mr. Wilmot to look into; but you should dis-  
abuse the Indians' minds that they should have all the land and all the fish, etc.

Mr. WILMOT.—I think it is the rule all over the Dominion that all Indians on  
their reserves have the right to fish and get all they want, but as soon as they begin to  
compete with white men, they must come under the same conditions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, we have allowed this to go on, Mr. Tiernan, because it is  
an Indian matter, but I think it has gone on long enough. We should not let you  
speak at all, Mr. Tiernan.

Mr. TIERNAN.—Oh, well, it has, perhaps, gone long enough. I am much obliged.

L. H. BAIN, a native of New Brunswick, in British Columbia since 1879, book-  
keeper for the "Delta" cannery at Ladner's Landing, where he is a resident, was duly  
sworn.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. How long have you lived at Ladner's Landing?—A. Seven years.

Q. Do you know a slough called Cohiluthan Slough?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you give the Commission some idea of the condition of that slough?—A.  
Well, I have made a rough sketch of the slough and vicinity. If you will allow me to  
put it in, I will explain it.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Does it differ materially from this printed map?—A. Well, it shows the resi-  
dences along the river and slough, and will explain it in more detail.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. What is the length of that slough?—A. Well, from the head down, about two  
miles.

Q. (Scanning diagram handed in.) What are these marks dotted along here?—A.  
Those squares are dwelling houses. Those red crosses are stables. These red lines show  
open ditches running into the slough. This here is a dam about half-way up the slough  
—this dam has been there for last two years. There is a gate in it, but any offal coming  
up the slough—very little could go by there, it would lodge. Very little would go to  
the head of the slough. This is the locality where there were several cases of typhoid  
fever, and this is the residence of Mr. Arthur, who gave evidence before the Commission  
at New Westminster.

Q. What is the distance between the "Delta" cannery and Mr. Arthur's residence?  
—A. About two miles or two and a half.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Going up the slough, is it longer?—A. No; it is two and a half miles by the  
slough. I may say in regard to offal of last year—previous to last year all offal was  
thrown in the river—before last year, I never heard of any complaints from offal being  
thrown into the river, and the fish from the "Delta" cannery—it has been running an  
oilery, and all the offal from the cannery has been going to this oilery.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Do you put that (the diagram of the slough) in as evidence, Mr. Bain?—A.  
Well, I merely made it to explain my statements. I would think that any offal that  
went up last year was the result of an accident. The place where we put the offal into  
the scow broke down, and the offal, for one day's work, went into the slough, and a  
portion of that may have gone up the slough, but none went in this year except that.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q.—Where are their canneries from here (showing plan)?—A. Mr. Wadham's can-  
nery is about half a mile from there. I was saying that what offal did go up the slough

last year was the result of an accident on account of the staging breaking down. I would also say that where there were several cases of fever, the people don't drink slough water—they drink water from tanks and reservoirs.

Q. And there they had fever!—A. Yes; here at the dam where any offal coming up the slough would be certain to lodge, there were no cases of fever at all; and if the water in the slough is contaminated it is from the drainage from the houses and stables.

Q. (Scanning diagram)—What does crosses here designate!—A. Stables.

Q. Is this plan drawn to a scale at all!—A. No; it is simply drawn from memory.

Q. Do you know whose house that is (pointing to plan)!—A. It is Herbert Kirkland's, about 50 or 60 yards from the edge of the slough.

Q. And who lives here!—A. Mr. Thomas Ladner's farmhouse.

Q. Where is Mr. William Ladner's, how far from the slough!—A. About a quarter of a mile, more or less; well, yes, about a quarter of a mile.

Q. Then what you contend is this: that by an accident the Delta cannery allowed a portion of its offal to get into the water and it was carried up into the slough!—A. Yes; now there was a certain part of it went up the slough, not all of it.

Q. What other canneries are there between the slough and Canoe Pass!—A. Wadham's, the Harlock, a cannery near Canoe Pass; all these were furnishing the oilery with their offal.

Q. Does the tide run very strong there!—A. There is a rapid current all down there.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Is the water in the slough fast!—A. Oh, about two miles an hour.

Q. What do you think the current of the Fraser is!—A. About six miles an hour.

*By Mr. Wilmet:*

Q. And does offal lodge anywhere else along the shore of the river, from Canoe Pass up to Ladner's Landing and Crescent Slough; have you ever seen any offal lodging along there!—A. I have never seen any offal along there and with the exception of Wadham's, all the offal went to this oilery.

Q. All got there!—A. Well, I cannot vouch for all offal from others, but as far as the "Delta" cannery is concerned, it all went except that day I told you of.

Q. How does it come down from the cannery!—A. It comes down in a shoot into the scow.

Q. And you think it all went to the oilery, except this case you mention!—A. Yes.

Q. Where are these houses drained into!—A. Into the slough.

Q. Do you live near the slough!—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Did you ever drink any water from the slough!—A. Yes; I have drunk it last season and every season.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Any consequences!—A. No.

Q. Have you heard of any one else, any typhoid fever!—A. One case at this hotel.

Q. Died!—A. No; I don't think so.

Q. When did that occur, last year!—A. Yes.

Q. The only year you didn't throw offal into the river, how do you explain it!—A. Well, it must have been through other causes.

Q. Do you think the drainage into the slough is bad for the public health!—A. Yes; I should think it is.

Q. Did you ever see the slough bare!—A. Yes.

Q. What colour was it!—A. Black and muddy.

Q. Did you ever see persons mixing lime juice with that water!—A. No; I don't know.

Q. How many houses do you think drain into the slough!—A. Well, I am not prepared to say exactly, about 50 or 60.

Q. Are you a resident of Delta!—A. Yes.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. The town is composed of how many inhabitants?—A. The village of Ladner's Landing? Oh, about two or three hundred.

Q. They have a council?—A. Yes.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Are these respectable men that compose this Council?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Quite respectable and representative of the people too?—A. Yes, I suppose so.

Q. And if these people said that offal caused this typhoid fever would they be incorrect?—A. They would be simply under a misapprehension, what I wanted to say was that very little offal went up last year into this slough.

Q. But you are putting your opinion against the municipal authorities on this matter?—A. Oh, I would not say that.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I think you are rather too sweeping, Mr. Chairman, we have had medical authorities here.

Mr. WILMOT.—But to refer to the municipal authorities, I only mean as to whether this man's opinion should over-turn the whole of the opinions of the municipal authorities?

Mr. HIGGINS.—I think we must take a point, Mr. Chairman, when we go down there to stop off and see this slough.

Mr. WILMOT.—But they are not catching fish there now.

Mr. HIGGINS.—No, they are catching sewage now, an eminent medical man has been before us and he says the microbes were in this water and he left the place because he could not get water to drink.

Mr. HIGGINS.—It has been sworn before this Commission that large numbers of sockeyes, lots of salmon have been thrown into the river, how long have you been at the Delta Cannery?—A. Seven years.

Q. Have you seen any thrown away?—A. No, not in large quantities, I have seen some.

Q. Have you seen any?—A. Yes, I have seen a few thrown off the wharf.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Do you keep count of the fish that come into the Delta cannery?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How many last year?—A. About 150,000.

Q. That was a short year?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. As many again came in the year before?—A. In 1890? No, I think not, not twice as many. To find out how many salmon are caught we simply take eleven times the number of cases packed.

Q. Well, how many cases were packed in 1890?—A. Between 15,000 and 16,000 I think, I am speaking entirely from memory and I may be a little off.

Q. What is the usual size of those fish?—A. In the good years they run smaller than in "off" years. In a good year, say 7 pounds, and in an "off" year probably a little more, 7½ to 8 pounds.

Q. How many cans are made from a fish as a rule?—A. Between 4 and 5.

Q. And what is done with the balance?—A. It was used for making oil last year.

Q. Is it not thrown away as offal?—A. It is thrown away as offal.

Q. How much do these cans hold?—A. Generally a pound.

Q. Is it possible to put 22 or 24 ounces in a can?—A. No, that is impossible.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. Can you put 20 ounces in?—A. No, 18 may be put in.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Is it usual to put 18 in?—A. No, they calculate to give good weight, in having a little more than the weight.

Q. Have you seen the boats fishing?—A. Yes.

Q. Do they keep one-third of the river clear when fishing?—A. No, I would not say they do.

Q. You have been a close observer in other matters, I thought you would take observation of that too?—A. I don't know as they left any part of the river vacant, they fish all over; immediately in front of Ladner's Landing they don't fish, because there is a bar there, and they don't fish on it.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. How many members does the municipal council of Delta consist of?—A. Five and a Reeve.

Q. Six then—are there any legal men in that body?—A. No, I don't know of any.

Q. Now if six or sixty non-professional men expressed an opinion upon a scientific subject of which they know nothing, and two men whose life-long business has been to study this question upon which they speak, expressed a contrary opinion, whose opinion would you be likely to accept?—A. I would be likely to accept the opinion of the two.

Mr. HIGGINS.—So would I.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Have you never heard that professional men often give direct evidence opposite to what others give?—A. Professional men? Oh, yes.

Mr. HIGGINS.—The question is whether non-scientific evidence is to be taken or scientific evidence, it is not to be thought likely that any member of this Commission should take evidence from persons who know nothing about the matter in preference to men who have made a study of causes of diseases.

Mr. WILMOT (emphatically). I state equally that every scientific man who has been brought here states that the water gets contaminated by the offal going into it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Order, gentlemen.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Never mind, Mr. Armstrong, you have had a week of it, I have not been here.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. Well, about the sockeye and lots of fish thrown away, did you ever see any "quimmat" thrown away?—A. No.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. And you are bookkeeper at the Delta cannery?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILMOT.—That is all, sir; that is all I wanted to ask.

B. J. SHORT, a native of New Brunswick, four years in British Columbia, manager of the Lulu Island Canning Company, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Well sir, what have you got to say?—A. In regard to this fish offal, we had a case of typhoid fever at Steveston, and we used to see all cases of fever before the cannery started in the spring—the offal did not appear to have any injurious effect.

Q. Anything else, sir?—A. I never see any offal around the shores of the river in our part.

Q. Is it a fact that it is all shoved out of the canneries into the water?—A. Yes; I think so, certainly the offal goes into the water.

Q. Is it correct that fish will run from six to eight pounds?—A. Yes.

Q. Is it also correct you get about four and a half cans from it?—A. Yes; about twelve fish to the case, the case weigh about twenty-two or twenty-one ounces, can and all.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. What would be the weight of the cans alone? Three or four ounces?—A. Yes; I suppose it will.

Q. Do they put more than a pound in a can?—A. Not much more.

## Marine and Fisheries.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. And the Lulu cannery is how far away from Ladner's Landing?—A. I think it is about six or eight miles, on the opposite side down the river—I think they call it six miles.

Q. You are a paid officer—manager?—A. No, a member of the firm.

Q. Do you receive any emolument for being manager?—A. No.

Q. All the emolument you get is a share of the profits?—A. Yes.

Q. Are you in and about the cannery during the season?—A. Yes.

Q. And you never saw any offal on the edges of the river?—A. No.

Q. Did you look specially for it?—A. No, I never look specially for it—oh, of course there may be some offal lying about, but I never noticed it.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. Are there many scavenger fish around your cannery?—A. Yes, they are very thick.

Q. And when you throw it over—they go at it at once?—A. Yes.

*By Mr. Armstrong :*

Q. How deep is the water where offal is cast in?—A. We have a shoot and it goes in at about six or eight fathoms.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. Is your building built on piles?—A. Yes.

Q. And about 40 to 50 feet deep are they?—A. Yes, our piles are 50 to 60 feet.

*By Mr. Armstrong :*

Q. Was there any sickness there before your cannery came?—A. I don't know—it is possible.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. How many boats had you?—A. We had twenty licenses.

Q. How many others did you employ besides the twenty?—A. Six or seven.

Q. And how many cases did you put up in '90?—A. We were a new cannery—about 10,000.

Q. And were those fish caught down on the sand heads?—A. Yes, down in the channel.

Q. Was fishing promiscuously done or was one-third of the channel kept open?—A. Oh, I think they fished promiscuously, but I suppose they do keep the channel open. I don't pay particular attention to that.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. Is the health of your vicinity good?—A. Yes, during the summer I do not live there—I live in Vancouver.

*By Mr. Wilmot :*

Q. When is it not healthy?—A. Well, in the spring—that was when the cases of sickness were there.

Q. Any sickness in the fall?—A. I don't know whether there was or not—the cases I speak of were in the spring before we can at all—they were turning up the soil in laying out the town site.

Q. The fever was ploughed out from the ground?—A. Well, I suppose so.

*By Mr. Higgins :*

Q. What is your favourite beverage down at the cannery, Mr. Short?—A. Tea or water.

Q. Do your hands drink the water there?—A. Yes, they have nothing else.

Q. Do they dilute it?—A. Well, I don't know—I suppose some do.

Q. Do they boil it!—A. Well, not there—they do in some places.  
 Mr. HIGGINS.—So ne water is not good at all unless boiled.  
 Mr. WILMOT.—Very good; that will do.

ROBERT MITCHELL, a native of Scotland, three years in British Columbia, a fisherman, and resident of Vancouver, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Now what do you want to say!—A. Well, I would like to get a license granted. I fished for Mr. Munn the year before last at S. a Islands Cannery—I was only paid 6½ cents, and I understand that some of those who had licenses was paid 20 cents.

Q.—Did you apply for licenses!—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And why were you not given a license!—A. I don't know—I did not go to see, but some of the boys in the same house went. I went out to the sealing that year. Mr. Munn furnished me with a boat and net.

Q. Did any of your neighbours fish for Mr. Munn that had licenses of their own!—A. No, sir; not that I know of.

Q. Did you get same price as the rest!—A. Oh, yes: I understand I got the same price as the others who had not licenses.

Q. Then what would you gain if you had a license!—A. Well, I would get 20 cents if I had a license of my own: I think I would: 15 or 20.

Q. Not having a license you got but 6½!—A. 6½.

Q. Then your neighbour in the boat got 6½!—A. No; we only got half of that, 3½ cents each.

Q. And others got 20!—A. Yes; Mr. Munn furnished the boat and net and gave us 6½ cents between the two of us.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. And if you had furnished boat and net, what would you have got!—A. I think I would have got 20 cents if I had a license.

Q. Well, Mr. Munn furnished you with plant and gave you 6½ cents!—A. Yes.

Q. When did you fish for Mr. Munn!—A. The year before last.

Q. How many fish did you catch!—A. Near 6,000, I think.

Q. Would that be the average of boats!—A. Yes; for Mr. Munn's cannery, I think.

Q. Can you give an opinion as to effects of offal in the water!—A. Well, I don't enjoy the water very good, but it don't do my health any harm. Of course I would prefer the water on the up side of the cannery to that from the lower side.

Q. Why one side more than the other!—A. Because the offal from the cannery was effecting the water a little on the down side.

Q. Then your principal complaint is you would like a license!—A. Yes; and I think the Sunday should be closed.

Q. Oh, you think all Sunday should be kept as holiday!

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Could you not keep it yourself and let the canneries break the Sabbath!—A. Well, I don't know as I could; being hired by the cannery and the cannery furnishing me with boat and nets. Of course I never did stay ashore. I always went out, but I did not like it. I don't know if Mr. Munn would care about it. If I had a license of my own I would not go out. I think the cannery would take the fish from me on Monday.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. Are there others like you who object to fish on Sunday!—A. Well, there are four that I know; they don't want to fish on Sunday.

Q. Then you say cannerymen rather hold out as a necessity that people they hire shall commence working at 6 o'clock!—A. No; I don't say that. I don't say the

## Marine and Fisheries

cannerymen compel men to go to work on Sunday at 6 o'clock. I never staid ashore, but suppose I told them I would not go, they would probably tell me to go. I think if I staid ashore on Sunday night and the cannerymen asked me to go, I dare say they would tell me to go, I never asked Mr. Munn.

Q. And you think the law allowing fishing on Sunday corrupts the morals of some men?—A. Yes; I think so. I never like to go out myself. I think the close season might be made from 6 o'clock Saturday night to 12 o'clock Sunday.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. But what would cannerymen do with fish caught on Saturday?—A. Well, I don't know.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. It was changed to suit them, you know.—A. Well, I don't think it is changed right.

Q. Do you think every British subject should have a license?—A. I think every one who wants a license should get a license.

Q. Do you think it correct to sell licenses, so one man gets a license and sells it to you for a certain price, is that right?—A. No, sir; I do not think any man should get a license and sell it to another man; I don't think it is right.

Q. Did you ever fish in Scotland in the rivers there?—A. No, sir; I fished in Scotland in the deep-sea fishing.

Q. Were any inducements held out to you to come here to fish?—A. Yes; my brother was here, and he said it was a good place for fishing, and I came here.

Does your brother get a license?—A. No, sir.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. Is he a fisherman?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. You think that has a tendency to prevent people from coming here?—A. I do, because summer time is the proper time for fishing, and if you cannot get a license then, I don't see how you are going to do it.

Q. Then you think you should get a license, and that the close season should be extended to the whole Sunday?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well; that will do.

THOMAS CAMPBELL, a native of Scotland, three years in British Columbia, a fisherman, and resident of Vancouver, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilmot:*

Q. What have you got to state?—A. I have got to state that I put in the last two years for licenses and I could not get one.

Q. Was any cause assigned for this?—A. Well, I asked last year if any more were to be given out and he said there were five or six, but some others applied for them, and I asked him if they were fishermen and he said yes; they went to people calling themselves fishermen.

Q. Did you fish last year?—A. I fished on Sea Island cannery for Mr. Munn.

Q. How did you fish; on what terms?—A. Well, he gave me a boat and net and so much per fish.

Q. How much?—A. Six and a half cents.

Q. That is between you and your man?—A. Yes.

Q. What was current price to people fishing with licenses?—A. Of their own?

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes.—A. Twenty cents.

Q. Would you have got 20 cents if you had licenses of your own?—A. Yes; I think I would.

Q. How many boats fished for that cannery?—A. I cannot say.

Q. How many fish did you catch in your boat last year?—A. About 4,000.

Q. Was it a short year?—A. They called it a poor year.

Q. And yet you got 4,000 salmon?—A. Yes.

*By Mr. Armstrong :*

Q. Have you anything more?—A. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Thank you; that will do.

JOHN BROWN, a native of Portugal, in British Columbia since 1858, a resident of Vancouver, a fisherman and boatmaker, describing himself as a British subject since the time of the first elections being held in British Columbia, was then duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilnot :*

Q. Well, what is your complaint?—A. I want a fishing license.

Q. Have you ever had one?—A. I had one four years ago and have made application every year since but got no answer.

Q. Then your complaint wholly now is that you want a license?—A. Yes.

Q. Where do you want to fish?—A. On the Fraser River.

Q. Have other persons got licenses since you applied, any of your neighbours?—A. No, not my neighbours, but many applied 4 years ago and have got licenses, but I have not.

Q. Have you fished for canneries since?—A. No, I am getting too old to fish myself, but the canners get licenses and they don't fish them either.

Q. And you want a license as well as them?—A. Well, I could pull a boat any way.

Q. Then your principal object is to get a license if you can?—A. Yes sir, that is what I want.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—That will do; thank you.

JOSEPH GOUSTAF, a native of Portugal, in British Columbia, since 1874 and a British subject by naturalization since 1892, a resident of Vancouver, and a fisherman, was duly sworn.

*By Mr. Wilnot :*

Q. What do you want?—A. Well, I have been fishing since I came in the country the biggest part of the time and I have made application for licenses for the last four years but could not get one.

Q. And is that the principal matter you wish to bring before this Commission?—A. Yes sir.

Q. Well sir, I don't know as we can do anything more for you than to record your name and that you want a license; would one be enough?—A. Yes, one will do very well.

Q. And you have been fishing on the river?—A. Yes, I have been fishing for Mr. Ewen and for Mr. Munn.

*By Mr. Armstrong :*

Q. Where do you fish in winter?—A. Well one winter I was sick, last winter I fished right here in Vancouver.

*By Mr. Wilnot :*

Q. What kind of fish do you catch?—A. Small fish of all kinds, smelts, herrings, etc.

Q. You fish with a seine?—A. Yes.

Q. What length of seine?—A. About 50 fathoms, something like that.

Q. What meshes in the bag?—A. An inch extension and 2½ in the "wings."

Q. What length of bag?—A. 3½ fathoms.



## Marine and Fisheries.

Q. And you catch a great number of small fish, don't you?—A. There used to be a great many, but now there are not so many, all we catch is small enough for the market.

Q. Do you ever get smaller than small enough for the market?—A. A few, but very few.

*By Mr. Armstrong:*

Q. And when you catch those very small fish you pull your seine ashore and pull all those small fish in don't you?—A. Well, sometimes the smaller ones go through, we cannot get them.

Q. Do they go through half inch mesh?—A. Oh yes, smelt will go through sometimes, smelt are very small fish.

Q. All along this coast is the same, you people, Portuguese, Italians, etc., fishing here all use the same small net you had in your own country, and you catch the same small fish of all kinds, young salmon and all kinds. A. Oh, some salmon come here but they never breed here, we never get young salmon.

Q. Well, but the point is that you catch a great many small fish which if they would become in a year or two fit for the market?—A. Well, we never catch small ones anyway, they go through, we have to use this small mesh to catch them, we cannot catch them any other way.

Q. You drag the net ashore with all the fish in it—do you pick them out for market?—A. Yes.

Q. What do you do with the small ones?—A. Well, the little ones let go if they are no use—sometimes we just throw the fish out and let them go.

Q. Do you think many live to get out?—A. Oh, yes; many of them.

Q. Well, the point is that these young fish are thrown on shore when you draw the seine and then they are left there to rot?—A. Well, let them prove it—but it was the oil factory ruined the fishery—not us.

Q. How did they do it?—A. Well, they threw in lots of refuse from the factory and it drove the fish away.

Q. What effect has it to throw refuse like this in?—A. Well, it spoils the fishing grounds and drives the fish away—he has quit that business now.

Mr. HIGGINS.—He is dead.

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. And you think throwing in this offal destroys the fish?—A. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Very well, that will do. After an interval of a few minutes and no witnesses coming forward—

Mr. WILNOT.—I judge the publicity of this meeting has been very general, because there has been a large audience all day and it appears there are none others to come forward.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I move we adjourn to New Westminster, to Monday, at 8 a.m., or such time as the steamer will be ready to go down the river, so we may inspect the location of the canneries, etc.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes, all right.

Mr. WILNOT.—Very well—Monday morning at 8 a.m., but before adjourning, I wish to present a communication to the Board, which I have received from the Vancouver Board of Trade, which I will read, and then hand to our Secretary for incorporation in the Minutes of Proceedings.

## VANCOUVER BOARD OF TRADE.

George E. Berteaux, President; W. F. Salisbury, Vice-President; A. H. B. Macgowan, Secretary.

VANCOUVER, B.C., March 11th, 1892.

To the Members of the Royal Fisheries Commission, Vancouver, B.C.

"GENTLEMEN,—At a meeting of the council of this Board held last evening, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, viz:—

"Whereas the salmon fisheries are of great importance to the city and to the province in general, and

"Whereas in the markets of the world there is very keen competition, with the Alaska and Columbia River fisheries in this business; and

"Whereas the consequence of any hindrance to the successful prosecution of these fisheries would result disastrously to the country.

"We, the council of the Vancouver Board of Trade, beg respectfully to submit to the members of the Royal Fisheries Commission, the following recommendations, viz:—

"Licences.

"1. That in view of the large amount of capital invested in the canning business and of the extensive preparations that have to be undertaken for the fishing season so long in advance of the actual commencement of operations, it is essential for the canners to be able to rely on having a certain fixed number of boats with which to prosecute their industry, and that this number should not be less than 25, which number should not be subject to change from year to year; also that for the northern canneries the number of licenses held by those canneries last year be not subject to reduction.

"Offal

"2. That, whereas, we believe the disposal of the salmon offal in the Fraser River in deep water, is neither injurious to the health of the people nor to fish life, the canners be not required to do more than deposit it in deep water, as hampering regulations in this respect might act most prejudicially to the industry.

"Close time.

"3. That in view of the extremely short fishing season, the regulations as to weekly close time on Fraser River, remain as before, viz., from 6 a.m., on Saturday, to 6 p.m., on Sunday, by which arrangement practically no work is done on the Sabbath.

"Hatchery.

"4. That the hatchery is worthy of every support, and that it is desirable that inspectors be appointed to further investigate and report on the habits of salmon, especially in up country waters; and by marking fish to obtain closer information as to their movements.

"Commending these observations respectfully for your consideration,

"I have the honour to remain, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) "A. H. B. MACGOWAN,

Secretary."

[Seal.]

Mr. PORT, of New Westminster, who had previously given evidence upon two occasions, then entered into an informal conversation with the Commissioners, the substance of his remarks and complaints being as follows:—

That the difficulty in connection with the interim licenses was that the number to be granted was too small.

Mr. McNABB.—I have instructions that the granted number of licenses were not to be exceeded.

## Marine and Fisheries

*By Mr. Wilnot:*

Q. How long is it since that order came?—A. About a fortnight ago.

Q. Oh, yes; that is, the old order will stand good until the new decision is reached. Only for the present the interim licenses will go on.

Mr. PORT.—But the final recommendation of the Commission should not interfere with work that is going on now.

Mr. McNABILL.—Mr. Port is interested in getting licenses for catching fish that are running now—these are the fish he wants. He wants to get ten licenses, and I told him I could not see my way to recommend that he should get ten, because I received word that they were all to be placed on a similar footing.

Mr. PORT.—Well, I may say I do not think the interim licenses should effect the number afterwards given—I have prepared ice and other things.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. You were on the stand at New Westminster, Mr. Port?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it was stated that you sold fish to the canners?—A. That is not correctly stated, sir.

Mr. WILNOT.—The witness must have forgotten that he was on oath.

*By Mr. Higgins:*

Q. Well, I think we had it from others than fishermen?—A. Well, I have frequently sold surplus fish to the canneries.

Q. Did you freeze any fish last year?—A. Well, we don't intend to freeze any this year.

Q. What do you do with your licenses?—A. Well, we ship away to other places. You must remember we are handling large quantities of fish. I would like to see every deserving man get a license.

Q. Well, the opinion of the Commission was, I think, that you were at an advantage over other parties?—A. Now, on the basis of 1888, I can use the catch of 30 boats.

Q. I think the aim of the Commission should be that although you should not be at the mercy of individual fishermen, they should be placed so they are not at your mercy. I must say the way the license system has been conducted is simply scandalous.—A. Well, I had to have 10 licenses, and during the other part of the season I had to take salmon wherever I could get it. We export our fish nine-tenths of the time, but when we have a surplus of fish we sell them to the canneries.

Mr. WILNOT explained that the complaint made against Mr. Port was that during the sockeye run he sold his fish to the canneries whilst obtaining licenses as a freezer; also that he thought persons going into the freezing business should have a certain number of licenses and that his belief was, that in time the freezers would take the place of the canneries.

Mr. PORT.—I admit the situation as regards the licenses, and selling fish looks unfavourable for the freezers.

A party in the audience here stated that the fresh fish dealers in Vancouver had been looking to Mr. Port and Mr. Vienna for their supplies of fish, and if licenses were denied them (Port and Vienna) they would have to be given in some other way.

The CHAIRMAN declared the Commission adjourned at 4.35 p.m., to meet again in New Westminster at 8 a.m., on Monday, 14th March, for the purpose of proceeding down the Fraser River, by steamer, to inspect the location of the canneries, Coholuthan Slough, etc.

NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., 14th March, 1892.

The Commission met on board the steamer "Robert Dunsmuir" at 8 a.m.

Present: S. Wilnot, Esq., Chairman; Hon. D. W. Higgins, Mr. Sheriff Armstrong, Mr. Charles F. Winter, Secretary.

At 9.10 a.m., the steamer got under weigh and proceeded down river by the south or main channel, the morning was bright and sunshiny, but the air was extremely cold and penetrating with a slight breeze from the sea.

Passing the various canneries the downward portion of the trip extended to the lighthouse out in the mouth of the river, where a turn was made and the home trip commenced. At Ladner's Landing a stop was made for dinner and for the purpose of the Commissioners inspecting Cohiluthan Slough. The Commissioners inspected the Slough at its mouth at the "Delta" cannery about 1.30 p.m. Slough here about 20 yards wide at high water and but a mere streak when tide is out. Water at time of visit was of the colour of porter, and when dipped up in a glass tumbler looked like cold tea. The Slough looks like a big ditch with high, soft, muddy banks, and the water appeared stationary, it being near flood tide. To the taste the water did not appear to be so very disagreeable, though the eye was repelled by its appearance and the place from which it came; a flavour of decaying wood and vegetable matter was perceptible. The soil about the banks had a peaty appearance and water trickling into the slough was discoloured. The Commissioners took vehicles at Ladner's Landing and proceeded along the slough to the top dam about 2 miles from the "Delta" cannery—about  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a mile up the main dam was passed, and where much complaint had been made of offal lodging, etc., and of it being backed up by the tide to this point. The banks here were also soft mud, surmounted by a fringe of small brush and wild grass. The Commissioners were accompanied by Messrs. Thomas and W. H. Ladner, and Mr. D. J. Munn, who kindly pointed out the various points of interest and explained the question of offal in the slough from their different points of view. At the head of the slough the party met Mr. Arthur and Mr. E. S. Brown, farmers of the neighbourhood, and the former of whom had appeared before the Commission and giving evidence at Westminster. These gentlemen explained the deposit of offal at the head of the slough and the pernicious effects such had upon the surroundings and with much warmth reiterated their assertions that it was most injurious to the health of the community and particularly harmful to cattle in that the slough was the only place from which they could obtain water for the stock. Both Messrs. Arthur and Brown stated that in summer the stench of decaying offal floated up by the tide to the head of the slough and then left on the grass and bushes as the water retired, was something awful and that fish heads, guts, tails, etc., could be taken out in barrow loads quite plentifully. On return from inspecting the slough, Mr. Higgins left for Victoria by steamer "Princess Louise" at 3 p.m.

The "Dunsmuir" with Commissioners Wilnot and Armstrong, accompanied by the Secretary, left Ladner's Landing for Westminster at 4.15 p.m. Before leaving, the Commissioners visited the "Delta" cannery, this is one of the old canneries and of course not being in the season, everything was in a condition of winter quarters; the building is partly constructed upon piles overhanging the water, with a swift current and some twelve feet of water at the outside.

The next cannery visited was the "Standard," Laidlaw & Co., but as it was closed up, the party did not land but viewed the surroundings from the steamer. This cannery is a large new building, said to have been erected by the owners at a cost of about \$9,000 for the purpose of obtaining twenty additional licenses. It has a frontage of about 200 feet, and is built entirely upon piles with the water all the way under. Water at the edge of pier said to be about fifteen feet and the current strong.

The Commissioners next disembarked at Mr. Ewen's cannery or rather canneries, for there are two large ones alongside each other. Mr. Ewen has the largest and finest equipped establishment on the Fraser River, and is capable of putting up 2,000 cases of salmon a day. The canneries are built partly on a small island near the west bank of the channel and partly on piles overhanging the water—a current of about six miles an hour runs here, and the water at the dock is about fourteen feet deep. The new building which was put up to obtain the twenty additional licenses when all canneries were limited to twenty each, is 160 by 80 feet and cost \$16,000. The party were shown throughout the buildings and all details explained by the caretaker and Mr. Munn, to the latter of whom the party were indebted for much valuable information on technical matters and small details.

Empty cases (wooden) cost 16 cents each, tins cost \$1.00 a case of 48 cans, and the buildings and material are insured for 2 per cent. In the new building, 8,000 cases of new empty tins presented quite a formidable array.

The Commissioners and party reached New Westminster, at 6.10 p.m.

## Marine and Fisheries.

The following information re catches by boats was tendered by the book-keeper of the "Delta" cannery at Ladner's Landing :—(extracted from the books of the establishment in the presence of the Secretary of the Commission).

1891.—From 1st July to 20th July, boats took less than 20 a day; on 2nd July boats begin to take over 100 fish a day; on 24th July, 192 is highest; at the end of July, average about 90 to the boat, but in the beginning of August the takes are larger, thus :—On August 1st, one boat takes 274 salmon; on August 2nd one boat takes 300 and 368 salmon; on August 3rd one boat takes 418 and 438 salmon; on the 6th August one boat gets 605 fish.

Then by the end of August they average 200 and 300. And the total fish for the season was in 1891, with thirty-five boats, 140,080 fish, and in 1889, with thirty-two boats, 331,676 fish.

The following written statement was submitted to Mr. Wilmot by Mr. C. Stanley, of Guichon's Landing, and was ordered to be incorporated in the minutes of the Commission :—

"GUICHON'S LANDING, March 4th, 1892.

"To Mr. Wilmot :

"SIR,—In giving evidence at the Commission, I did not know the cannerymen were wanting more licenses, as I had just come up from Guichon's Landing at the time, last Saturday, 27th February, and did not know anything about it, and could hardly believe it when I was told some wanted 25, others more, and not being a good speaker, I forgot lots I would like to say on account of forgetfulness on my part. I therefore write you a little of my experience on this river, and could say much more about canneries, but I think this is sufficient. I will take oath any time to any part of it, or all, if there is any doubt about it. I have no malice against cannerymen; I only write what is true and strictly true as that.

"(Signed), CHARLES STANLEY."

The following enclosures accompanied the above communication :—

"In regard to licenses on the Fraser River at the present time, and in previous years, they have been issued unfairly and in an indifferent manner, especially towards the fishermen, who are granted 150 licenses; because the Indians and fish markets take licenses out of that number, also the Port Haney fishery, with seven licenses, that a canneryman bought up last year; also Mr. Port's and Dutch Bill's licenses were turned over to cannerymen in the sockeye run, and I am told Mr. Max Mowat had 10 licenses to himself last year. If there is to be a limit to licenses, I think 600 is enough and no more—give 300 to cannerymen and 300 to fishermen, instead of 500 for the Fraser River—any more than that number is not required. They could be divided in different ways, say 300 to canneries, 250 to fishermen, 50 to Indians. At present the canneries have 20 licenses apiece, that is too many, and more so in the large runs of fish, from six to eight boats will catch all the fish wanted; the others lying idle in a big run. I myself ran a camp of Indians for a canneryman in 1889; big run; and only eight or ten boats' fish were wanted to supply the cannery. The Indians were taken and put to work in the cannery when they were stopped fishing; in fact the cannery then had too much fish and threw them away into the river, I myself throwing over two scow loads at the camp, all rotten fish. In 1890, I ran a camp of Indians for Ben Young, Canoe Pass, in sockeye run, and there saw fish destroyed by wholesale, also a large ship load from the American side (Point Roberts) thrown overboard. He could not can them, although they were all paid for; in fact he knew, like all the others, that he could not can them, for his cannery was overloaded at the time they were caught and before. The excessive waste and indifference in previous years has been as great, in fact more so, for they have done as they pleased, and as I have had eighteen years experience at salmon fishing for myself and running of Indians and whitemen, I can justly say twenty licenses are too many for any cannery on the Fraser River, no matter whether the runs are large or small, and the fish markets being granted ten licenses is a shame and a wrong to the fishermen—they can-

not use the fish, therefore turn these licenses over to the cannerymen—the canneryman perhaps making them a present of one or two of their own licenses to get them—from two or four licenses is plenty for any market, and they should be made not transferable, and all fishermen one license apiece, to be made not transferable, to prevent selling of licenses to other men, and by those means men who are not fishermen will not apply for them—the Inspector to have power in case of sickness to allow men to fish, providing the fishermen cannot fish it himself. Fishermen who are not British subjects to have no license. In regard to some men who have licenses, I think they can do well without them—I mean men who have fine farms—from 100 to 500 acres of land—and others who are employed at the canneries at all around yearly wages, and who don't fish in any run of fish except the sockeye run for the cannery they work for. The canneries could get along well—taking one year with another, big run and small run—with from ten to fifteen licenses. In big runs that is too many—any more than that number would hurt the free fishermen. I hear the Indian Agent wants 100 licenses—I consider fifty licenses is enough—in fact none at all is more like it, for they are wards of the Government which gives them farming implements of all kind—they have fine farms, and are helped by the Government—they can fish all the year round for themselves, and also pay no taxes, they were here before we came but let them use their ways of fishing and not the whiteman's invention, thereby underselling the whitemen. If allowed that privilege the same as whitemen, let them pay taxes, have votes, etc. We are taxed \$2 road tax and \$3 provincial tax, and \$20 for a license—fancy \$25 to go to work—just for the privilege of working one year. A large majority of Indians will not work contract, but demand days' wages, although the cannerymen would like to see the Indians get licenses, for as they say 'we can control the Indian but not the whitemen.' The Indians don't know enough, but the whiteman knows too much—no wonder they want twenty-five licenses, they could do without us all, and in big years not half those licenses would they want. They told the Government in 1887 and 1888, by unlimited fishing the result on the Fraser would be similar to the Columbia, and now they say 1,000 licenses would not hurt the river, but give them twenty-five licenses and the fishermen all they want—what selfishness—what are the fishermen going to do with all the licenses they want! Why they could not sell their fish, because Mr. canneryman has twenty-five and too well the canneryman knows it. Last year a cannery fished for spring salmon and sold them to the fish market thinking he would get the fish market licenses, but got left. These capitalists should be brought to time, for as long as sufficient salmon and good returns, never mind the excessive waste—let us have those licenses they cry—Don't interfere with us! don't force us to recognize anything, and then we private monopolies can laugh, grow rich and look on everything with enmity and contempt—by wealth and cunning we can win the means of luxury—never mind the fishermen, they are weak and ignorant—such is the difference, they would have people think. The inequality in the possessions of individuals means crime and all sorts of misdeemeanours the world over—want tempts the poor, and to preserve former gains tempts the rich—reduce these licenses and give fishermen a show on all rivers in British Columbia—it will prove successful, cause a larger distribution of money, and it will be circulating among the many instead of these few capitalists and agents who want it all, in fact, would take the world, if they could get it—that stops them.

#### *Offal.*

"In regard to offal thrown into the river it is most injurious and causes sickness—I myself have been sick drinking river water. I know people on the Delta flats say they had been sick through offal thrown into the river, not only offal but rotten fish, and those swell-heads the canneries throw into the river at night. A swell-head is a rotten can of salmon unfit for market, perfectly rotten. The Chinaman takes a soldering iron knocks a hole in the can so that it will be sure to sink, the stench would knock a nigger backwards let alone a white man—thrown overboard at night as well as other garbage, all offal floats more or less, except the swell-heads, in eddies and creeks, sloughs, dyke ditches, etc., and cause a most obnoxious smell and sickness. It floats up and down with the tides, some gets on the land, some hangs around the sloughs, etc., a pes-

## Marine and Fisheries

silent mass of rotteness—the water unfit to drink—you must go a good distance in a boat from the banks to get a bucket of water. A law should be passed making the cannerymen tow everything in the shape of offal outside to the Gulf of Georgia and there dump it into deep salt water and not be allowed to dump it in fresh water at all. It gets into our nets and makes them stinky and is very nasty to get out, and I have no doubt the salmon don't like it, for if it makes man sick surely it makes salmon sick."

### *Clear Salmon.*

"Except that the licenses are not issued early enough in the spring, say by the 15th of March and not later, for sockeye salmon, one week longer would do no harm, the close season the cannerymen don't trouble about as long as they get enough sockeye, even then if they do fish for them, they say they are no good—there should be no close season on them."

### *Nets.*

"The fishermen use a 7½ and 8 inch mesh for spring salmon during March and April, 50 meshes deep. When the river rises about May, they cut these nets down to 30, 35, and 40 meshes to fish along the bars and banks of the river. A 50 mesh net can only be used early in the spring and then in deep water and only on slack water, high and low slacks. For sockeye 5½ and 6 inch mesh, the majority of nets 40 meshes deep, some 30 and 35, very few 50 mesh, the majority of nets used at the mouth of the river are 35 and 30 meshes deep, and I do not think that nets at the mouth and as far out as the sand banks do any harm, there being lots of room for the fish to escape, most all the fishing there is done on tides, high and low slack, whereas up river they fish day and night never giving the fish a show to escape. There is a good 12 to 14 miles of fishing ground on high slacks in length and about 5 miles wide, so fish get more show to escape than anywhere on the river."

### *Hatchery.*

"The hatchery is doing good and more hatcheries should be put up, and I would like to hear of them hatching out more red salmon. I have taken sockeyes that had their tails clip in oval shape; they were fine large fish; one weighed 12 pounds; I sent its tail to the inspector in New Westminster. I always believe salmon return again to their own rivers. Trout on Harrison River and lake destroy lots of salmon ova and eat young salmon. The sockeye themselves are a very voracious fish. When fighting they destroy spawn, but do not eat it; they disturb it, and it floats to the top of the water and floats away. I have fished on Harrison River and lake and watched them doing it. Saw-dust is very bad for salmon; more to young fish."

### *Oil Factory.*

"I believe if some one with experience, he could make it pay. The oil factory on the river at present is a small concern, and in a big year one or two canneries could supply it. With drivers and retorts for rectifying the oil they could get away with much more and after rectifying it and refining it they could find a market. I have worked around herring factories where they rectified the oil, then refined it, and the gurry that was left was used as a fertilizer after it went through a drying process, and it was a success. I have refined a good deal for herring in the winter time; also for the factory that was near Vancouver, but the herring failed and came less every year; the supposed cause was throwing the offal into the inlet in previous years, before Mr. Syrett built his fishery."

### *Seining for Salmon.*

"Seining for salmon should be stopped everywhere, in river, harbour, bay, creek, or anywhere a seine can be used; it is a most destructive net; it takes everything it comes across, both little and big, destroying lots of young and small fish. I have seined both for salmon and herring, and know that for salmon it is most destructive."

"Sir, in my opinion of the small-heads thrown from canneries, I think about 200 cases to a cannery would be the most thrown away; of course some more, some less; it is rotten fish; and in 1889 the Harbort Packing Co. was the company I ran a camp for in the sockeye run, and I will take with any time that ten licenses will run a cannery in full blast. In the two big years, even last year, the canneries at the mouth of the river could only just struggle through, in fact refused fish and would buy none; in fact there are some canneries who could not take seven or eight boats' fish and keep their wharves clear.

— Foreigners such as Austrians, Italians, Greeks, etc., should be made to prove they have resided in the country the required time before getting citizens' papers, as a number come from the Puget Sound ports to fish here in the spring and sockeye runs, and then go back and become United States citizens, so that they can fish on Puget Sound.

"I am, sir, your obedient servant.

"(Signed) CHARLES STANLEY.

"Quichon's Landing, Fraser River."

The following memorandum was submitted by Mr. John McNabb, Inspector of Fisheries for the province of British Columbia:—

*Memo. for consideration of the British Columbia Salmon Fishery Commission.*

The following suggestions are respectfully submitted:—

"1. That the weekly close time on all rivers in British Columbia, with the exception of the Fraser, be from 5 p.m. on Saturday to 5 a.m. on the following Monday. Reasons:—A very large majority of the fishermen are Indians who object, and in fact refuse to labour on Sunday, and as it would not prove detrimental to the interest of the cannerymen or any one else to make the change, the religious convictions of the Indians should be respected."

"2. The close time for trout at present is from the 15th of October to the 15th of March. I beg to suggest that it be changed so as to read from the 1st day of October to the 15th day of February. Reasons:—Before the 15th of October the trout are ripe and in many streams have deposited their spawn, whereas in February they are in fairly good condition and are in demand for local consumption, other kinds of fish then being scarce."

"3. That from the 1st to the 25th day of September, both days inclusive, all net fishing be disallowed on the Fraser River. Reasons:—After the 1st September, sockeye salmon are unfit for food, and should have an unobstructed run to their spawning places, after the 25th September, the cohoes, or silver salmon, are running in numbers and are in demand for salting and market purposes."

"4. That the manufacture of oil as an article of commerce, from herring be disallowed in British Columbia. Reasons:—Herring are valuable as food fish, they are sold in large quantities in the markets of Victoria, Nanaimo, Vancouver, and New Westminster, and are highly prized as food by settlers on the coast and Islands of the province, and also by the Indian population. They are also the principal bait fish of our waters. Destroying them in immense quantities for oil is a useless waste, as the dog-fish on the coast which are very destructive to all other kinds of fish, are sufficiently numerous to supply all the oil for which a market can be found at present."

(Signed.) JOHN MCNABB.

*Memo. for Information of Commissioners.*

List of salmon canneries owned and operated on the Fraser River during the season of 1891, by the Anglo-British Columbia Canning Company, of London, England. Bell-Irving and Patterson, Agents, Vancouver and Westminster.

"British Columbia," "Wadham's," "British American," "Canoe Pass," "Phenix," "Britannia," "Garry Point," "Amundson," and "Dunfries." Licenses issued for season of 1891, 20 boats and gill-net-catch.

Schedule of Fresh Salmon Dealers who have applied for licenses for season of 1892.



## Marine and Fisheries

"E. W. Port & Co., Wm. Vianan, James Wise, J. E. Lord, Boutilier & Co., Neilson Bros., Port Haney Freezing Co., C. F. Petty & Co., Wright Bros. (9.)—24 canneries have also applied."

This closes the proceedings of the Commission so far as the public were concerned. But on the 19th March the Commissioners met in New Westminster to draw up a report. The minutes of which meeting and the conclusions arrived at are as follows:—

NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., 19th March, 1892.

The Commission assembled at 1 p.m., in the parlour of the Colonial Hotel.

Present: Mr. S. Wilmot, in the Chair; Hon. D. W. Higgins, Sheriff W. J. Armstrong, and Secretary C. F. Winter.

Mr. Wilmot read the following communication, which was transferred to the Secretary for record:—

NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., 18th March, '92.

"SAMUEL WILMOT, Esq.,

Chairman, Fisheries Commission.

"DEAR SIR.—We beg to direct your attention to the fact that the dam in connection with the Dominion hatchery is located upon Section 7, B. 5, N.R. 1 W. Mr. Alex. Miller, the present owner of the property wishes us to notify you that unless the Government is prepared to purchase the property the dam must be removed forthwith. Kindly advise us of your intentions in the matter, and oblige.

"Yours respectfully,

"(Sd.) RAND & MILLER,

"Real Estate Agents."

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, gentlemen; I suppose we are ready for business. It is scarcely necessary for me to say, gentlemen, that what we do here to-day will be perfectly private and whatever conclusions we come to will be submitted to the Minister at Ottawa, and it will be for him to say whether they shall be made public or not.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh, yes; keep it perfectly private—give nothing to the press at all. Now I think we might take up first the points on which we can agree at once.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I may say gentlemen, that yesterday I drew up a memorandum of matters here.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh, by the way, may I ask if you will receive an affidavit as evidence? A man named Cassidy came to me and asked to put in an affidavit as evidence.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, yes; we have his evidence—it was handed in the other day and I gave it to the Secretary to insert upon the Minutes. There have been one or two others also, and we have placed them upon record. Well, first of all gentlemen, if you will permit me, I will just read over the conclusions I have come to.

(Mr. Wilmot here read over his recommendations which are detailed further on.)

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, put in another paragraph that they shall not be allowed to destroy the dog-fish for the liver only. If they want to make oil from the fish, let them use the whole fish. You see, they kill the dog-fish just for the liver and throw the rest on the bank and let it lay there. There is just as much oil in the body and it does not require machinery to take it out.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well, we will put that down. Now, are there any other questions that you gentlemen would like to place upon the list, and we can discuss them specially afterwards?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Perhaps you make a paragraph of that (handing in letter) in regard to that train of guano and eau-de-cologne!

UNION CLUB, VICTORIA, B.C., 3rd March, 1892.

"MY DEAR Mr. HIGGINS,—Being much interested in the proceedings of the Fishery Commission now going on, and hearing from friend Rithet that you control the running of the car-load of eau de cologne necessary for the peaceable transportation of the Fraser River offal from the salmon canned, I hope you will not overlook an old friend anxious to carry that car-load of eau-de-cologne, when shipped.

Yours very truly,

(Sd.) D. J. BROWN.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Then here is an analysis of that water at Cohiluthan Slough, that I took down the other day. I had it analyzed in Victoria by the Government Analyst, a very clever fellow :—

*Analysis of Water.*

Had a brown colour and unpleasant smell, re-action neutral.		
Total solid residue.....	143	grains per gal.
Solid inorganic matter.....	49	"
Solid organic matter.....	94	"
London Thames Companies.....	18.5	total solids per gal.
Manchester water supply.....	4.7	"
Glasgow, Loch Katrine.....	2.3	"
Sample of sewage.....	55.0	"
Chlorine existing as sodium chloride.....	31	grains per gal.
London Thames Companies.....	1.2	"
Tunbridge Wells.....	3.7	"
Sample of sewage.....	9.9	"
".....	11.5	"
Free Ammonia representing principally vegetable organic matter.....	40	parts per mil.
Albuminoid Ammonia (animal matter).....	90	"
Free Ammonia. Alb. Ammonia.		
West Middlesex Water Co.....	.01	.07
Grand Junction Co.....	.01	.08
East London Co.....	.03	.09
Sample of sewage.....	16.20	.90
Harrowgate sewage.....	55.00	3.00

A slight examination under the microscope did not show any living organisms only occasional jelly like masses. As shown by the analysis the water is very bad, but whether it would be the cause of disease or not could be better shown by a careful microscopic examination.

(Signed,) H. CARMICHAEL,  
*Analyst for B. C.*

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, gentlemen, that goes through all correspondence I have received on the fisheries question during the last few days. Now, whatever matter you wish to take up first!

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh, take up the first item.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes, take them seriatim.

Mr. WILMOT.—Then you think these clauses cover the ground generally!

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes, oh yes, if there are others we can add them.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, then, the first clause is :—

1. That each canning establishment actually carrying on the canning industry shall be entitled to receive eighteen (18) boat licenses to fish as its maximum number, and that the fee payable for each such license shall be \$20.

(Continuing.) Now, I think a cannery getting licenses should be in actual operation. Suppose a man puts up a shell and does not work it but simply puts it up in order to get a certain number of licenses, he has an advantage over other parties, don't you think? It strikes me from the evidence and from what we hear from many cannerymen that it was very unfair. The only man it would effect I fancy would be Mr. Ewen.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Did he not work the new one!

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh no, not at all. It is a fine building and with all conveniences but he has not set it going. Now, if we say that he, or any person situated like him shall get so many licenses for a non-working establishment, it gives him a certain advantage over others, therefore I put in the clause "canneries in actual operation" Mr. Higgins.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes.

Mr. WILMOT.—Do you think it is correct in the main?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I think it is if we don't cut the licenses down too short so as to put the canners at the mercy of the fishermen.

Mr. WILMOT.—Then there is another point to take into consideration this year—with the larger number of licenses given to the fishermen, the canners will be supplied with more fish than they ever had before. There will be four or five times the number of fishermen working than ever before, you know.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes, but as long as they don't be able to say you must pay so much for the fish.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, yes; but as long as the canners get a certain number they cannot be combined against.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—And don't you think if canners could get licenses for a non-working cannery, a man could put up many such and have an entire monopoly. Then you remember Mr. Johnston was very much opposed to it—I think they should be in actual operation.

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes, in actual operation—it is a matter between the canners solely. If they want to run the second establishment why they must just get their fish from the contractors, but I am satisfied this year they will have all the fish they want to work with. And also I think the fish will be reduced in value too.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes, and afterwards it will regulate itself—I think after this year fish will be very cheap. But how many licenses are you going to give?

Mr. WILMOT.—Ah, that is the question. Now, Mr. Johnston's evidence is very important on that point—his evidence was put in writing after giving his evidence in Victoria—I will just read from it:—

“For the information of the Commissioners, I beg to state in reply to the question which was addressed to me, viz.:—‘How many salmon were used for canning purposes and how many cases were packed with same at the Fraser River Cannery, Deas' Island, last season? that 80,745 salmon (sockeye) were supplied to the cannery and were used in packing 7,137 cases of 48 lb. tins each, being an average of  $11\frac{1}{4}$  fish per case. A tin nominally 1 lb. contains more than a pound of fish—about  $1\frac{1}{4}$  oz. as an average.”

Well, now, taking that as data, gentlemen, I find that fifteen boats will produce the amount represented at a catch of 5,000 fish to a boat, which I think is about a fair average. The canners ask for twenty-five licenses, and here a man in his own calculation makes fifteen boats do it. Some say ten but I think that altogether out of the question. Now, taking everything into account, with the increased number of boats to be fished, I think twenty-five out of the question—ten I think too low—they should get a sufficient number to allow of them being fairly well supplied.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, perhaps some of these canneries might not use them—they might keep them as a reserve check—now, you should place enough licenses in their hands to be protected—I think they should get twenty-five—I want to see them protected and also the fishermen protected.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, what is your opinion, Mr. Armstrong? I could hardly agree with you, Mr. Higgins.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, I have been thinking this matter over a good deal and have been talking with many people about it. Some say some years ten boats will catch all they can handle—then in a poor year fifteen will get enough and twenty will leave the canneries entirely independent of fishermen altogether. I don't want to see the fishermen entirely deprived of the means of selling their fish and so I think the figure should be placed somewhere between fifteen and twenty.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but in a bad year they want more than their own boats—they often use more than their own boats—they should get a number so as to keep them not at the mercy of the fishermen.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, if you give them ten they would not be at the mercy of the fishermen.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh, well, but that would not do in a bad year; they would be at the mercy of the fishermen.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, but what makes me think 25 too many is that when the canners were in Ottawa they asked for 20. Now they ask for more: perhaps next year 25 will not be enough.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, we should look at it from all sides and I certainly think we should protect the fishermen; if we give the canners all the licenses they want they have no use at all for the fishermen.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I think 25 licenses a fair number.

Mr. WILMOT.—And you say, Mr. Armstrong, between 15 and 20?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, there is quite a difference between you.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, what do you say yourself?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I will say 18—divide the matter up—18 licenses to be given to the canners. In this way we are only reducing them two from what they had before, and then the greater number of fishermen will enable them to get all the fish they want. It does not matter to me personally whether they get 15 or 50, but looking at it from a public stand-point, I think the fishermen should be thought of. I would not like to say the canners should get many less than they have had before, but these fishermen are all paying their \$20, and they should have a fair opportunity.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, call it 20 licenses and I will call it unanimous; I don't want to see this important industry put down.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—We don't want to effect it at all.

Mr. HIGGINS.—What do you say, Mr. Wilmot?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I could not go beyond 18.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, we will divide on the question. I cannot agree to curtail one of the most important industries we have here: I say 25.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I say 18.

Mr. WILMOT.—I say 18.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—And that number is more than any fisherman gave in his evidence as fair for them.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I don't see what the fishermen have to do with it. They are like trade associations everywhere: they have no sympathy with capital at all, while capital feeds them.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well then, now. For the section with 18 boats—Messrs. Armstrong and Wilmot. Nay—Mr. Higgins, who requires 25 licenses. Now, for the second section.

Mr. WILMOT.—2. That each freezing establishment, actually engaged in the freezing and exporting of fish, shall be entitled to obtain not exceeding seven (7) licenses, and that the fee for each license shall be \$20. (Continuing.) Now, I understand that Port and others calling themselves freezers got 30 licenses, or were working 30 boats. Now, I don't think he is a freezer at all, but this section has to do with men putting up large establishments for freezing fish and shipping them east, and I think the business should be encouraged. There is only one person here engaged in the business that I know of, or perhaps two.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, the same thing applies to them as to canners, for if you give them all the boats they want they will not buy any fish from the fishermen.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, if I remember rightly, Mr. Armstrong, when we were at the establishment the other day that man said he did not care much about the licenses, as he could get all the fish he wanted. But, I think, as they were going to establish similar establishments on the Skeena, they should get a certain number of licenses.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, you might put it in this way, for each thoroughly equipped freezing establishment with a capacity of so much, or something of that kind, for he might say he was going to build at Skeena, Point Haney, and other places, and he might get so many licenses, and then not put the establishments up at all.

Mr. HIGGINS.—How many would you give each freezer?

Mr. WILMOT.—Suppose we gave them eight licenses?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—That is too much in proportion to what you have given the canners. They don't send forward as much fish as canners, and I think if you give them six or seven it would be all they want.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes; but you must not confound the man who gets his fish and simply ships them in ice with the real freezer. One has simply to have but a mere shell of a building, if he so likes, while the other has to have air-lined walls, manufacture his ice, etc.; it is a very different matter.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but we are talking now of the man who builds a proper freezer?

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes; persons actually engaged in freezing and exporting fish; what number would you say, Mr. Higgins?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Say seven, but do not let them sell their fish to the canners.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes; say seven licenses.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well; we will insert seven in the section and call it unanimous.

Mr. WILMOT.—Now, Section 3.

3. That each establishment engaged in the actual business of shipping or exporting fish in ice, or otherwise, but not in the manner of freezing or canning, shall be entitled to obtain not exceeding three (3) licenses, at a fee of \$20 each license.

(Continuing.) These are persons shipping fish in loose ice. The expense of putting up a place for carrying on this business is very small compared with the other. Now what do you gentlemen suggest?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, you suggested the other, what do you say?

Mr. WILMOT.—I would say 4.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I say 3.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I say 3, I want to encourage our fishermen.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well, we will make it unanimous, 3 licenses.

4. That each and every local trader or dealer in fish for home consumption, in cities, towns, or country, actually engaged in such traffic, shall be entitled to obtain not exceeding two (2) licenses at a fee of \$20, each license.

Mr. WILMOT.—Now this is for persons who have a shop or market, they do not export or freeze fish nor do they fish themselves, but they may have boats.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—2 boats are enough to supply a market.

Mr. WILMOT.—Do you all say 2?

Mr. HIGGINS.—These are traders in cities, towns, or country?

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Very well, 2 licenses.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, unanimously 2 licenses.

5. That all bona fide fishermen being British subjects and actual residents of the province shall be entitled to obtain one (1) license to fish, upon payment of the sum of \$20 for such license.

Mr. WILMOT.—I think that is unanimous, one license to all.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I would make the fee less, say \$15.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh well, it has been \$20, I do not think it would do to lessen it.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Very well, leave it at \$20, but those poor fishermen of whom you are so considerate, is it not a high figure for them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh, yes, but it has been \$20, leave it at \$20.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well, that is unanimous then, \$20.

6. That every actual resident settler (with his family residing with him), shall be entitled to obtain one (1) license to fish, upon payment of \$2 for the same, and shall be permitted to fish in any of the waters of British Columbia, except in any prescribed limits at the mouths of rivers or streams, or during the close times, every such settler shall be a British subject and such license will only permit of fishing for family use, but not for sale or barter.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I think, although the fee is only \$2 you might make it less, I think a man should be able to fish in front of his own land.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh well, it is simply a regulation, the fee is made small and is simply to control them, in fact they ask for it themselves.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I would strike out the part about the family.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, I want to prevent half-breeds and others going up river and squatting anywhere and calling themselves settlers when they really are not, they have no families nor do they own land.

Mr. WILMOT.—Then you see Mr. Higgins, this applies to up the river, beyond where the ordinary commercial fishermen cannot fish; whereas the settler can fish anywhere. Then this regulation gives a sort of control over them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I think you had better let that go Mr. Higgins, it would not do to let everybody fish for their own use. They could not all get a net and boat, and they cost money, and if a man has a family he will be more careful not to run the chances of being fined, etc.

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes, I think, Mr. Higgins, that you had better let that go.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Very well, I will take your experience for it.

Mr. WILMOT.—That is agreed then, Sec. 6 unanimous.

7. That the regular annual close time for salmon fishing in any of the rivers, or streams of British Columbia, shall be from the 1st of October to the 1st March following in every year.

That the weekly close time for fishing for salmon or other fish in the waters of British Columbia shall be from 6 o'clock on every Saturday till 12 o'clock midnight on the following Sunday.

Mr. WILMOT.—Now, in the recommendations of persons giving evidence in this matter they say the use of  $5\frac{1}{2}$  inch mesh shall prevail from 1st March to 25th August. But at the present time they do not use  $5\frac{1}{2}$  but 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ . Now they say a close season from 1st November to 1st March, but the spawning is not over by 1st November. I think you can all see the propriety of having an annual close season, because after the operations of the canneries are over, when these fish are caught with spawn running out of their bodies, a disgusting fish is being put upon the market. Then as regards the Sunday close time; now, I believe it should be up to 12 o'clock Sunday—I think the whole Sunday should be kept.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, in that case you see the canneries would have no work on Monday morning.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes, but I think there is another point we should look at. The canneries have been used to hiring Indians, and while that is all very well, you must remember they take the place of whitemen, and although they are got cheaper, still it is a fact that the whitemen are in the long run cheaper, because the whitemen will go out at any time whereas the Indians will not. Now if the Indians are paid by the piece—as a rule they will bring in a good many salmon, but if they are paid by the day they know just how many fish it will take to pay their wages, and so you will not get many fish. Now, I would put it either that there should be no Sunday work at all, or I would leave it as it is now—if there is a full run of fish on Monday they will have them in by noon and there is plenty of time to put them up.

Mr. WILMOT.—Then the Indians have religious scruples they tell me—by the way what time do you have daylight here?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh, it is nearly daylight all night. I think I would not advocate any change in the Sunday close time.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I go strongly on having all day Sunday as a day of rest—I may say, Mr. Higgins, that I have noticed more inclination in British Columbia to break Sunday than in any other province in the Dominion, and now I see that Parliament is going to be asked to pass an Act that at the Canadian Government Exhibit at the World's Fair all shall be closed on Sunday.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, but I think if we put it at 3 or 4 o'clock on Monday morning—how would that do?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Pshaw—3 or 4 o'clock Monday morning? why you don't want them to catch fish at all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh, well; it is no use trying to persuade me that they cannot put up fish on Saturday—I know they could do it if they liked but they want all day Saturday and Sunday to themselves.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, but the canners asked themselves to have the close time Saturday and Sunday down to Monday, at 6 a.m. Then it was reduced to 6 p.m., Sunday.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, probably it did not work well that way and so was changed.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, for three or four years they asked to have it made at six o'clock Monday morning; then they asked that it be changed back to Sunday evening. Now, if they were satisfied with 6 a. m., Monday, for several years, 12 midnight Sunday would be no hardship.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, if they didn't know what they wanted, I think we should establish a rule for them: I say make it Monday morning.

Mr. WILMOT.—I certainly think all the Sunday should be kept, especially as you are trying here to christianize the Indians, and I do not think as a people we should allow this bad example to remain.

Mr. HIGGINS.—It will be hard work christianizing them, I fear. (Laughter.) Well, what do you say, Mr. Wilmot? From when till when?

Mr. WILMOT.—From 12 o'clock Saturday, if you choose, to 6 o'clock Monday morning.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I would say from 6 o'clock Saturday morning until 3 o'clock Monday morning.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but I don't think you will stop Sunday work around the canneries, no matter what you do: you might as well try to stop work on sailing vessels at sea, making sail, reefing, etc.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, here is another view of the matter: there is going to be such an increase of fishing that the fish should, I think, get the advantage of it. Now there is going to be, I fancy, nearly a thousand licenses issued this year, and these will certainly sweep off the greater number of fish that come in: so you see they might fairly be given the advantage of an extended weekly close time. Well, what do you say, Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I say 6 o'clock Saturday morning to 3 o'clock Monday morning.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I will go with you, Mr. Chairman, and call it 12 o'clock Sunday night.

Mr. WILMOT.—Now, cannot we make it unanimous, Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Very well; I do not want to be too obstinate; say 12 o'clock Sunday.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Now, on the first paragraph of that section 7, I would prefer being placed on record as wishing to defer my opinion until I have read the evidence. You see I have not had the advantages of you gentlemen in being present at all the sessions, so I would like to give my views on that part of the section later on.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well; what do you say, Mr. Armstrong? Do you agree with the leading paragraph?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh, yes; I think that is all right.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well; we will say: Ayes—Messrs. Armstrong and Wilmot, and that Mr. Higgins defers his opinion until he has had an opportunity to read the evidence.

8. That the limitation for the size of mesh of salmon nets and the period in which such sized nets shall be used, shall be as follows:

A net with a 7½-inch mesh for catching spring salmon to be used from March 1st to August 15th. A net with a mesh not less than 5½-inch mesh for sockeye, cohoes, or other salmon, may be used only between 1st July and 1st October. The above meshes are extension measure.

Mr. WILMOT.—This is for catching spring salmon only.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Is that all right?

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, yes; I think so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—But would not 15th July be sufficient?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, it would only effect the freezers; you know they cannot catch sockeye with the big net.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—No; they cannot catch sockeye with the big net.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But suppose a run of sockeye came in?

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, well, they cannot fish for sockeye very well; you see the net is different and they do not begin to fish for sockeyes until July, the latter end of July.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But if they do come they can use them. Is not that so?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, but I don't think they come in so early; they have been caught later every year; they are not caught for canning until about the 15th or 20th of July.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Still, is it intended to prohibit the use of smaller mesh? I fancy I have heard of the cohoes being caught for canning in September or October.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh, no; not to any extent.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Mr. Winter, have you that cannery's testimonial? If you have, please let me see it.

The Secretary handed the memorial to Mr. Higgins.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, at any rate, gentlemen, you see during these spawning times fishing should be prohibited, because, if fish are then caught, foul fish are being put upon the market.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh, well, they don't do that; after the 1st of September the sockeye will not suit the market.

Mr. WILMOT.—No; but if they are caught and frozen and sent on in that way, then it is stocking the market with a poor fish.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes; when they are thawed out they are a poor fish.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, from the weight of evidence presented, all salmon spawn about the same time, and any salmon caught in rivers after September is not fit for food. Of course, if caught in the sea, it is different; but in the rivers they are a soft flabby body, and of no use for food. Now, the  $7\frac{1}{2}$ -inch mesh is for spring salmon, and they should be caught between 1st March and 15th August; after that they are not caught. Then with  $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch for sockeyes and cohoes, and all other salmon, from 1st July to 1st October.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, would you mind laying over that matter until I look over the evidence; I would prefer that.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well, but you see from the Order in Council the  $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch mesh is established for sockeye and the cannery themselves asked that  $7\frac{1}{2}$  should be established for the spring salmon.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Very well; we will lay that over.

9. That all licenses so obtained shall not be transferable under any conditions whatever, without the consent in writing from the Department of Fisheries.

Mr. WILMOT.—I think that is unanimous; it is fair all round.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh, yes.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Is it understood that no one but genuine fishermen shall get a license? No watchmakers, saloon-keepers, or others?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, it is the intention that none but fishermen shall get fishermen's licenses. In section 5 we say all *bono fide* fishermen, British subjects.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Very well, I think section 9 is all right.

10. That the tidal boundaries for all, or any fishing for commercial purposes connected with canning, freezing or exporting of salmon, shall be at Pitt River and at a line across the Fraser River at Whonnack Creek, above these two points on the Pitt and Fraser Rivers, netting or fishing for commercial purposes, as above described, is forbidden.

Mr. WILMOT.—You see, Mr. Higgins, the limit has been, as per this map in the departmental report for 1890, up to Hammond and Pitt River Bridge.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, was this ever enforced?

Mr. WILMOT.—No, but it has been substantially admitted by all. Now what we desire is to have all the body of the river and upper waters for spawning purposes, and to place the limit on the main river at Whonnack Creek, there is no commercial fishing beyond there, is there Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes, up to the Mission.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh yes, I recollect, we had a letter about that, some one was catching fish and supplying the C.P.R. Now I think it would be most desirable to have all these upper waters for the benefit of the fish. There is no fishing beyond Mission now, and you will see the propriety of establishing a fair boundary.



## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HIGGINS.—There is no fishing in Pitt River at all now is there?

Mr. WILMOT.—No; none at all, this has been kept entire and we keep planting young fish there all the time. Well, what shall we call it? Shall we say that section defining the limit at Pitt Bridge and Whonnack's Creek is unanimous?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh yes.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Very well.

11. The use of seines for capturing fish of any description is wholly forbidden at the mouths of all rivers or streams within certain limits thereof as may be laid down by the Department of Fisheries.

Mr. HIGGINS.—They do not use seines down here do they?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—No.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, they say they cannot catch any fish up in the northern rivers without them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—They fished out the Victoria Harbour for you.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, yes, but as a matter of fact the packers should never have been permitted to go up to these northern rivers and start establishments if now they are to be deprived of the only way in which they can catch fish for their factories.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I am sure, Mr. Higgins, if you had had the experience I have had in the use of seines in the east you would feel very decided about their pernicious effects.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I would not agree with that section, for I am satisfied if the men up there could catch fish without a seine they would not use it.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, but in that very river you mean the great decrease in the catch there is the most cogent reason for preventing seining in my opinion.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but they cannot catch them at all with anything else.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—What does the statute say on that point?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, the British Columbia Regulations say "the use of seines is forbidden within the waters of British Columbia," (O.C. 7th Nov., 1890.) In large rivers like the Fraser and Skeena the principal fishing is now carried on right out in the estuary with drift nets—now to interfere with drift nets at the mouths of rivers would be very injudicious, but when you come to these small rivers where drift nets might just as well be used, the regulations say these seines shall not be used.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I thought Mr. Spencer's evidence was very clear on that point, where he stated that they could not catch fish at all unless they used these seines.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well you see these seines are not used elsewhere they are most destructive appliances, even drifting for salmon is allowed only in your province, it is not permitted elsewhere.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Now, about the one-third of the channel—Subsection 8 of section 8 of the Fisheries Act reads "so as to obstruct more than one-third of the width of any river." Now, that must be somewhat mixed, because I have always understood that it was the one-third that was to be left open. Now, how is this? that would mean that two-thirds was to be left open—I never understood it that way.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, Mr. Secretary, just take a note of that, and we will have it looked into. I do not understand the matter—I always understood that it was the third that was to be kept open—we will have it looked into Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, about the seines, I would like to make a reservation in favour of the Nimkish River—I know Mr. Spencer has told me often that they could not catch any fish at all with the gill nets and he had tried if often.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, but look at the decrease in their catch there for the past six years. Then, Mr. Mowat was instructed to take eggs up there and they were taken up and what has become of them? I don't know, but they were asked for on account of the river having become depleted. The representations were that the river had declined and fallen off very much, and then since that according to the published returns of the catch it has much further fallen off, and if Mr. Earle or any one else will only look at the real reason, they will see that this seining is the real cause of it. Mr. Earle when down last year was very anxious about it, and the Minister went into the matter thoroughly and said the thing was so clear that they were destroying their own river.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh, well; but the decrease has only been for a year or two, and I don't know as that has been the cause. I would vote for the resolution making a reservation in favour of the Ninkish, until I get further evidence. —I do not want to go it blind until I get full information.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, what do you say, Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—This is of course a recommendation to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to change the law.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I don't know as it is exactly.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, I don't know as I can consistently ask the Minister to exempt one river—I am satisfied that seines are injurious and should be not allowed.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, as far as I am concerned, I am quite satisfied with the section—no rivers should be exempted.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, you might let that section lay over—I cannot agree to it at any rate until I get further information.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, leave it until later.

12. That there shall be no discrimination with regard to the numbers of licenses, nor the fees payable for the same, for canners or others throughout the waters of British Columbia.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes, no discrimination. Oh, but what about the Skeena River? What are the reasons they give for a continuation of the present discrimination in fees—there they pay but \$5 now I believe, while here the rate is \$20.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, on the Skeena they say there is no hatchery while there is one here—while here they complain there is more competition than up north and the license here should be as low, or the same figure as theirs.

Mr. HIGGINS.—What number of licenses were held by canneries up north last year—can you tell, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WILMOT.—There were 300 licenses on the Skeena—200 to canners and 100 to outsiders.

Mr. HIGGINS.—How many canneries were there?

Mr. WILMOT.—Eight or nine.

Mr. HIGGINS.—And what do they pay for their licenses?

Mr. WILMOT.—Five dollars. And these people down here all unanimously declare that the fees should be made the same.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but there is the hatchery here—that is quite an item.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, but they have a corresponding advantage up there—they do not have the same competition.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—And then fish run much more regularly on the Skeena than here.

Mr. HIGGINS.—What do the fishermen pay here?

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, they all pay \$20 for the past three years. I have no doubt that the northern men will make a fuss about it, but you can bring up the evidence from canners themselves.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, put me down that there should be no discrimination in the licenses nor fees, except in the case of northern canneries, where the fee should remain as heretofore.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I agree with the resolution that there should be no discrimination in the license fees.

13. That the throwing of fish offal or dead fish, saw-dust, mill rubbish, or any deleterious substance into the rivers, or other waters frequented by fish, is alike injurious to these waters, and to the inhabitants residing along the same, and therefore, the laws relating to the prevention of offal and deleterious substances being thrown into such waters, should be enforced in the interests of the community at large.

Mr. WILMOT.—Now, I go in for that, because I go upon the principle of it being correct and being enforced anywhere else. What do you say, Mr. Higgins?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I am under the impression that if the offal was towed out to deep water—out to the deep channel of the river, it would pass out to sea and do no damage at all; but, if left near the canneries, I would not allow it at all.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I have been much surprised in getting evidence from fishery officers—for we have had another Commission, or investigation, since last with you—in

## Marine and Fisheries.

regard to the old way of cribbing the offal. That was a fearful practice, they say, much worse even than letting it go as now.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I think if it was towed out into the stream, it would do no damage, but this thing of dumping it down near the canneries, I would not allow.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, now, is it not a question whether we are doing justice to all parties in allowing this offal to be thrown away? Now, you know the dog-fish are plentiful, and they catch them just for the livers. Now, if they would put up oils, fertilizers, etc., out of this offal, could not a most merchantable article be made?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but they say who have tried it, that it does not pay. Mr. Ladner says that he cannot get rid of the article.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, here is Tom Cunningham, in giving his evidence states he could take twenty tons of it. Now, why don't Ladner say I will give it to you for \$10—why could they not sell it cheaper to introduce it? Certainly, the oil is very profitable at 35 cents a gallon, for that is all dog-fish oil is worth, and even supposing they do lose \$200 or \$300 for a year or two until this business is put on a good footing, I don't think we would be doing right to let all this matter and good material be thrown away. Then, if put in near the canneries, how can you expect it to float away?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh, yes, it floats away, and then a great deal of it is eaten up. Then, you know, two flood tides go out each day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—But another tide comes in and it all comes back again. I think if you don't let them throw it away they will find some means of getting rid of it.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I cannot see any use in piling obligations upon these people, they have tried the oil factory but it has not been successful.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, but here, take the two canneries up here, are you going to make them go to the expense of getting scows and taking it out to the deep water when they might be making good use of it? Now, that Frenchman down there who has been running the oil factory, he says it pays.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But how does he know? Tom Ladner says it does not pay, he is very positive about it and he ought to know if any one does, for he advanced the money, I understand. How would the Frenchman know anything about the financial part of the scheme?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, of course, the prohibition of putting in offal is a thing that is law now anyway, so whatever we do it will simply be a recommendation to the Minister.

Mr. WILMOT.—I am sorry our Secretary has not had time to get the evidence of Mr. Arthur written up, his statement and the evidence given by that delegation that came up from Ladner's was to my mind very conclusive.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I don't think so at all, it is a very dirty hole down there anyway.

Mr. WILMOT.—Then we had a very sensible man in Victoria who in giving his evidence stated that he had left the place (the Delta) on account of the injury from this offal.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, he left his boys there anyway.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, gentlemen, let us get down to the point, of course you know my opinions pretty well, I think this should not be allowed to be thrown into the water at all. I would be very sorry to give any opinion that would militate against the canners, but I have had several conversations with representative cannerymen, Mr. Wadhams, Mr. English, and several others; and I have said this country is getting more populated all the while, and you had better make some arrangement about this offal before you are actually forced to, but they will not take any steps as long as they are allowed to go on as they have been doing. Then our cod fishermen say the offal and entrails of fish put in the water spoil their fishing grounds and so they bring them ashore now and bury them. Then again we have the evidence right here in Vancouver Harbour, that the offal thrown in from an oil factory, offal of herring, etc., has driven the herring away from the harbour altogether. Now these are glaring examples and should be thought over.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—And if you take this offal all out into deep water after a time you will soon have no salmon at all coming in here.

Mr. HIGGINS.—How about the quantities of dead salmon up the river, is not that just as bad, or rather infinitely worse?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, gentlemen, I think there is no use discussing the matter further. I think, Mr. Higgins, you will have to be in a minority in this.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, what is it you propose?

Mr. WILMOT.—I will re-read the section. (Read over section 13.)

Mr. HIGGINS.—What is the penalty now under the Statute for putting in this offal?

Mr. WILMOT.—Not exceeding \$100 for each and every offence. I think, however, the close of this section would mean only the ordinary penalty coming under the general penalties of the Act—not exceeding \$20 for each offence, but you see it means every offence—it can be doubled as often as you like. It is really a question in my mind which penalty would apply—perhaps the \$20, because it could be renewed every time the offal was thrown in.

Mr. HIGGINS.—You admit there is no possibility of burying the offal, I suppose.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, yes; it could not be buried—the only other way, I think, would be to cremate it. But the way I look at it, I think a small sum from each canner, say \$25 would erect an establishment for providing for this matter.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, but you see here is the law (showing Fisheries Act, Sec., 15)—it can be buried ashore or put in perforated boxes—now these people have been simply carrying out the law.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I must say I am not prepared to give an opinion on that subject.

Mr. HIGGINS.—And the Act goes on to say, “the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may exempt from the operation of this subsection, wholly or partially, any stream or streams in respect to which he considers that its enforcement is not requisite in the public interest.” (Sec. 15, ss. 2.)

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, yes; he can do that, and if your political representatives can bring sufficient influence to bear upon him, why we cannot do anything, but as far as we are concerned, we must give our opinion irrespective of that. Now, what do you say, gentlemen, is this clause of our report carried?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Wait a moment, don't be in a hurry—let us see what the law says.

I don't think this perforated box applies to the fisheries of the Fraser River—I think it applies to the deep-sea fisheries—of course, you must understand that this is simply a recommendation to the Minister, and I would not recommend anything that I did not think could be carried out.

Mr. WILMOT.—Then the resolution stands Yea!

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes.

Mr. HIGGINS.—No, I do not agree to it—I say that the offal should be thrown into the swift water of the river so as to float out to sea.

14a That it would be expedient for the improvement of the fisheries in British Columbia that additional fish hatcheries to the one now in existence should be built in well selected localities on the upper branches of the Fraser River—the evidence before this Commission being largely given in this line.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Unanimous—I was simply delighted with the hatchery when I went up to see it and I have never ceased to tell people what a splendid thing it is. I tell you it opened my eyes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes, unanimous—we want more of them.

15. That the great destruction of herring now practised to supply a few crude oileries on the coast and elsewhere should be prevented by departmental enactments and thus avoid the too great and rapid depletion of an important factor as bait for carrying on deep-sea fisheries of the British Columbia coast in the future.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, you will have to count me out of that, because I have not seen any evidence on that point, and cannot give any opinion.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, what do you say, Mr. Armstrong?

## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, I think that is quite right—I don't think the herring should be destroyed for the oil alone.

Mr. WILMOT.—And you, Mr. Higgins, defer your opinion not having read the evidence.

Mr. HIGGINS. Yes, sir; I do.

16. That the halibut fisheries on the coast of British Columbia, now assuming great importance from the successes which have attended the catches lately made and their introduction into the markets of Boston and elsewhere on the Atlantic coast, demand the husbanding care of the Government for the advancement of this new industry, which bids fair to give additional wealth to the inhabitants of British Columbia.

Mr. HIGGINS.—All right—yes, I agree to that.

Mr. WILMOT.—And you, Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes, that is quite all right.

Mr. WILMOT.—There is no doubt your halibut fishery is destined to be of great value here; your fish are so sweet and luscious.

17. That the inclination on the part of the fishermen is to increase the killing capacity of the drift net by giving it greater depth than appears necessary for fairly legitimate fishing, and as the depth as shown now varies from 30 to 60 meshes; and in order to place all fishermen upon the same footing in their fishing operations, and to guard against the too excessive destruction of the salmon, the drift-net for sockeyes should be limited to a depth not exceeding 50 meshes.

Mr. HIGGINS.—What is the depth now?

Mr. WILMOT.—They run from 30 to 50 meshes, practically making them a seine for all intents and purposes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Are not most of them 40 meshes deep now?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, no, I think not. I may mention the reason I put this clause in is because I got a letter from our inspector of fisheries this morning, and it seems the fishermen feel very much on this point. You see, a fisherman starts down with a 60-mesh net, and he floats down to where others have only 35 or 40 meshes, and so one will have 20 feet of net in depth and the other only 10, so you see the advantage of the one is obvious. Now, with a limit of 50 meshes they will be fishing with an equality of 16 feet of net and will all be on the same footing.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; but I have heard no evidence on that—would it not be better to say the limit shall not exceed 50 meshes?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, I have that in now.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Still, that is another point upon which I cannot give an opinion without further information. When do you leave, Mr. Wilmot?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, just as soon as I can get away.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh, well, there will be two or three points upon which I can write you.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—What is the length of the net now?

Mr. WILMOT.—150 fathoms.

Mr. HIGGINS.—What are the nets in the east?

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, well, they fish with nets 6 feet deep generally.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I will be able to write you on this, after I have looked over the evidence.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, what do you say, Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, I have no objection to it, as I think the majority of nets are 40 meshes now.

Mr. HIGGINS.—I defer my judgment—well, call it 60 meshes and I will vote for it now off hand.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I don't think the cannery will use those long nets, only the greedy fellows that want to fish for the spring fish. I will go in for 50 meshes.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I will defer my opinion until I have looked over the evidence on the matter. Of course, you will understand I have not had the same opportunity of hearing all the evidence as you two gentlemen have, and am, therefore, on many little points somewhat in the dark.

18. That doubts having arisen with regard to the actual meaning of subsection 8 of section 8, chapter 95, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, it is desirable, in the interests of river fishing in British Columbia, with reference to leaving portions of the river free from fishing, that not more than one-third of the river should be left open.

Mr. WILMOT.—Now, we have laid over some matters.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, the first part of section 7 I will have to look over before I can give an opinion, also section 8 and sections 11, 15 and 17.

Mr. WILMOT.—Now, what other matters have you to bring up?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—About the dog-fish.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, while we are on the salmon fishery, let us understand, if possible about the channel of the river.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, yes; you say that doubts having arisen as to the meaning of the Statute as to keeping open one-third of the channel? Subsection 8 of section 8 of the Fisheries Act—now it is desirable, in the interests of river fishing in British Columbia, with reference to leaving portions of the river free from fishing, that not more than one-third of the river should be left open?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; that will fetch it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes; not more than one-third.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Now, Mr. Armstrong, the dog-fish.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes; I want to prevent the killing of dog-fish for the livers only.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Do they kill many?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh, yes; they get thousands of gallons of oil every year, and they just take the livers out of the fish and throw the body of the fish on the bank.

Mr. HIGGINS.—What do they use it for—that is the oil?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—For lubricating purposes; it is used very much in the saw-mills, etc. It is very much like the salmon oil, but if they want to use the fish for oil they should use all the fish.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But could they not make manure of the rest of it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But it has never paid?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh, but they should throw that offal in the deep water.

Mr. HIGGINS.—What do they do with it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—They throw it on the bank and leave it there.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, now, see if this will suit your idea:

1. That the system now prevailing along the coast of killing vast quantities of dog-fish expressly for the use of the livers of said fish for oil purposes only should be discontinued, unless the bodies of these fish are utilized in the same manner.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; that is all right.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes; that will cover it first rate.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, sirs, what next?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, we have provided for the canners, the freezers, the exporters of fresh fish in ice and the fishermen, but have we provided for the salters of salmon?

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes; I was thinking of them—they ought to come in the list too, I think.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—The thing is now whether we should encourage the salting of fish when there is such a demand for the fresh fish.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, there are persons engaged in that line, are there not?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—I don't think there is any one engaged in it here unless when there is a surplus of fish.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, say we give them one license—my own impression is no one will go into the business of salting fish unless they cannot do anything else with them—it is generally an inferior article, salt fish of any kind.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, rather than have any trouble, if a man is going to make a business of it he should get two licenses anyway.

## Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, but the parties who will apply for them then will be the freezers.

Mr. HIGGINS.—But do not some of these canneries salt sometimes?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—They do when they have an over-plus of fish.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I think any one making a special business of it, either salters or smokers, should have a couple of licenses, but not to smokers or salters—not two to a man because he is a salter and two more because he is a smoker, say salter and smoker to each.

Mr. WILMOT.—Very well, we will say two each to salters and smokers—now, how does this read?

20. That salters and smokers of fish who carry on this specialty in curing fish for domestic or foreign markets, and not engaged in the fishing business in any other way, may be entitled to obtain two licenses upon the payment of a fee for each license of \$20.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; that suits it all right.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes.

Mr. WILMOT.—Now, none can complain that they did not all have a chance.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Now, there is another point which I suppose comes within our province to speak about, viz.: the number of guardians on the river. I think there should be another steam launch and that there should be sufficient additional guardians to properly enforce the law.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh, yes; that is a point on which we may very well express ourselves—a very important one too. How will this suit:—

21. That a suggestion is made to the department, for the advisability for further protection of the fisheries, that a sufficient number of additional guardians should be appointed to enforce the fishery laws.

Now, is that unanimously agreed to?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes.

Mr. WILMOT.—Now, gentlemen, what next?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, I would recommend that we suggest to the department the propriety of introducing shad and lobster to these Pacific waters.

Mr. WILMOT.—Hear, hear.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, before we leave the Fraser River, I think we should recommend that measures be taken to get the spawn for the hatcheries out of the early runs of fish. I think taking them from the late fish is the reason why we are getting later runs of fish every year. I may, of course, be wrong, it is a theory of mine.

Mr. WILMOT.—Would this cover both sockeye and spring salmon?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, you are only cultivating the sockeye as yet, but if the other fish are to be cultivated, I think it should also apply to them—I think you would have more chance of getting better fish and earlier runs.

Mr. WILMOT.—Then, will this recommendation cover it?

22. That it is expedient in the interests of the Fraser River fisheries that the early runs of the quinnat and sockeye salmon should be captured from which to obtain their ova for artificial breeding in the hatcheries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes; that covers it.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; but do you consider the spring salmon a desirable fish?

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Oh well, it covers both of them.

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes; some people say they want the sockeye and then many say they want the spring salmon—the freezers, for instance.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Does it take more capital to set up a freezer than a cannery?

Mr. WILMOT.—Well, that is a question—you see if they go into this business extensively they will have to get vessels provided with cold storage, etc., and it will be a very costly matter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Well, now, Mr. Higgins, you were about suggesting something when I interrupted you.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh yes: about the lobster and shad.

Mr. WILMOT.—Yes; you think they should be introduced on this coast?—A. I think that is a good idea.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well don't you think it would have some effect?

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh yes; I think so decidedly.

Mr. SECRETARY.—There is just one matter gentlemen, if I may remind you of it, I don't think you have any recommendation about oysters yet.

Mr. WILMOT.—That is a good idea, however, I had a note of it.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Well, you had better include the reference to oysters in the same resolution regarding the shad and lobster.

Mr. WILMOT.—All right; well now, how will this do?

25. That the introduction of shad, oysters and lobsters into the waters of British Columbia from the Atlantic coast, is most desirable, and that the Department of Fisheries be requested to institute such means as will bring about this most desirable enterprise.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Hear, hear, that will cover it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes that is all right.

Mr. WILMOT.—But we have not said a word about oyster culture here.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Oh; well, I think that is pretty well covered—if there are any other little points you may add them.

Mr. WILMOT.—Oh well, but it will just take a minute—now how will this read:—

24. That whereas the native oyster is found in some localities along the British Columbian coast and as they are becoming rapidly decimated by the action of a few fishermen and Indians regardless of consequences, it is desirable that the Fisheries department should take speedy action to prevent their extermination by establishing proper close seasons and encouraging persons who may be desirous of entering into the business of oyster culture.

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; that will do first rate.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.—Yes.

Mr. WILMOT.—Then gentlemen, do you all agree to these as our recommendations and our report—these recommendations from 1 to 24 inclusive, that we have just gone over?

Mr. HIGGINS.—Yes; except those sections or clauses which I am to consider and give my opinion after reading more evidence than I have done as yet, etc.

Mr. Wilmot, Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Higgins then duly signed the report in the order named.

The Chairman declared the Commission finally adjourned at 6 p.m.

CHARLES F. WINTER,  
*Secretary.*

## BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES COMMISSION.

### FINAL REPORT.

In the matter of the Royal Fisheries Commission, duly appointed by the Dominion Government of Canada, for investigating into matters relating to the salmon fisheries of the Fraser River, and likewise the salmon and other fisheries of the province of British Columbia, said Commission being composed of the Honourable D. V. Higgins, of Victoria; Mr. Sheriff Armstrong, of New Westminster, and Samuel Wilmot, of Ottawa.

Evidence being taken under oath from numerous parties in relation to the subject of the fisheries at the cities of New Westminster, Victoria, Vancouver and Nanaimo, the following conclusions have been come to on the subjects contained in the several paragraphs herein, which are numerically written, and are recommended for adoption by the Fisheries Department of Canada, for the conservation and maintenance of the fishing industries of the province of British Columbia. The recommendations are as follows:—

1. That each canning establishment, actually carrying on the canning industry, shall be entitled to receive eighteen (18) boat licenses to fish as its maximum number, and that the fee payable for each such license shall be \$20.

Ayes—Messrs. Armstrong and Wilmot; Nay—Mr. Higgins (requiring twenty-five licenses).

Carried—eighteen boats.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
*Chairman.*



## Marine and Fisheries.

2. That each freezing establishment, actually engaged in the freezing and exporting of fish, shall be entitled to obtain not exceeding seven (7) licenses, and that the fee for each license shall be \$20.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

3. That each establishment engaged in the actual business of shipping or exporting fish in ice, or otherwise, but not in the manner of freezing or canning, shall be entitled to obtain not exceeding three (3) licenses, at a fee of \$20 each license.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

4. That each and every local trader or dealer in fish for home consumption, in cities, towns, or country, actually engaged in such traffic, shall be entitled to obtain not exceeding two (2) licenses, at a fee of \$20 each license.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

5. That all *bond fide* fishermen, being British subjects and actual residents of the province, shall be entitled to obtain one (1) license to fish, upon payment of the sum of \$20 for such license.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

6. That every actual resident settler (with his family residing with him), shall be entitled to obtain one (1) license to fish, upon payment of \$2 for the same, and shall be permitted to fish in any of the waters of British Columbia, except in any prescribed limits at the mouths of rivers, or streams, or during the close times—every such settler shall be a British subject, and such license will only permit of fishing for family use, but not for sale or barter.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

7. That the regular annual close time for salmon fishing in any of the rivers or streams of British Columbia, shall be from the 1st October to the 1st March following in every year.

That the weekly close time for fishing for salmon or other fish in the waters of British Columbia shall be from 6 o'clock a.m., on every Saturday till 12 o'clock midnight on the following Sunday.

On the 1st paragraph of above section :

Ayes.—Messrs. Armstrong and Wilmot.

Mr. Higgins not having had an opportunity of going over all the evidence, and not being present at many of the sessions of the Commission, deferred his opinion on the paragraph until he had time to consider it.

The 2nd paragraph was agreed to unanimously.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

8. That the limitation for the size of mesh of salmon nets and the period in which such sized nets shall be used, shall be as follows :

A net with a 7½-inch mesh for capturing spring salmon, to be used from March 1st to August 15th. A net with a mesh not less than 5½-inch mesh for sockeye, coho, or other salmon, may be used only between the 1st July and the 1st October. The above meshes are extension measure.

Yeas.—Messrs. Armstrong and Wilmot.

Mr. Higgins deferred judgment until he had time to read the evidence.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

9. That all licenses so obtained shall not be transferable under any conditions whatever, without the consent in writing from the Department of Fisheries.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

10. That the tidal boundaries for all or any fishing for commercial purposes connected with canning, freezing or exporting of salmon, shall be at Pitt River, and at a line across the Fraser River at Whonnack Creek. Above these two points on the Pitt and Fraser Rivers, netting or fishing for commercial purposes, as above described, is forbidden.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

11. The use of seines for capturing fish of any description is wholly forbidden at the mouths of all rivers or streams within certain limits thereof, as may be laid down by the Department of Fisheries.

Yeas.—Messrs. Armstrong and Wilmot.

Mr. Higgins reserved his judgment until he had time to obtain further information on the subject.

12. That there shall be no discrimination with regard to the numbers of licenses, nor the fees payable for the same, for cannery, or others, throughout the waters of British Columbia.

Yeas.—Messrs. Armstrong and Wilmot.

Mr. Higgins thinks a discrimination in favour of the northern canneries should be made.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

13. That the throwing of fish offal or dead fish, saw-dust, mill rubbish, or any deleterious substance into the rivers, or other waters frequented by fish is alike injurious to these waters, and to the inhabitants residing along the same; and therefore the laws relating to the prevention of offal and deleterious substances being thrown into such waters should be enforced in the interests of the community at large.

Yeas.—Messrs. Armstrong and Wilmot.

Nay.—Mr. Higgins, who suggest that offal should be thrown into the swift water of the river to float out into the sea.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

14. That it would be expedient for the improvement of the fisheries in British Columbia that additional fish hatcheries to the one now in existence should be built in well selected localities on the upper branches of the Fraser River—the evidence before this Commission being largely given in this line.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

## Marine and Fisheries.

15. That the great destruction of herring now practised to supply a few crude oileries on the coast and elsewhere, should be prevented by departmental enactments, and thus avoid the too great and rapid depletion of an important factor as bait for carrying on the deep-sea fisheries of the British Columbian coast in the future.

Yeas.—Messrs. Armstrong and Wilmot.

Mr. Higgins defers an opinion, not having read the evidence.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

16. That the halibut fisheries on the coast of British Columbia, now assuming great importance from the successes which have attended the catches lately made and their introduction into the markets of Boston and elsewhere on the Atlantic coast, demand the husbanding care of the Government for the advancement of this new industry, which bids fair to give additional wealth to the inhabitants of British Columbia.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

17. That the inclination on the part of the fishermen is to increase the killing capacity of the drift net by giving it greater depth than appears necessary for fairly legitimate fishing, and as the depth as shown now varies from 30 to 60 meshes; and in order to place all fishermen upon the same footing in their fishing operations, and to guard against too excessive destruction of the salmon—the drift net for sockeye should be limited to a depth not exceeding 50 meshes.

Yeas.—Messrs. Armstrong and Wilmot.

Mr. Higgins defers his judgment till evidence is read.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

18. That doubts having arisen with regard to the actual meaning of subsection 8, of section 8, chapter 95, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, it is desirable in the interests of river fishing in British Columbia, with reference to leaving portions of the river free from fishing, that not more than one-third of the river should be left open.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

19. That the system now prevailing along the coast of killing vast numbers of dog-fish expressly for the use of the livers of said fish for oil purposes only, should be discontinued, unless the bodies of these fish are utilized in the same manner.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

20. That salters and smokers of fish who carry on this specialty in curing fish for domestic or foreign markets, and not engaged in the fishing business in any other way, may be entitled to obtain two licenses upon the payment of a fee of \$20 for each license.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

21. That a suggestion is made to the Department for the advisability for further protection of the fisheries, that a sufficient number of additional guardians should be appointed to enforce the fishery laws.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
Chairman.

22. That it is expedient in the interests of the Fraser River fisheries that the early runs of the quinnat and sockeye salmon should be captured from which to obtain their ova for artificial breeding in the hatcheries.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
*Chairman.*

23. That the introduction of shad, oysters and lobsters into the waters of British Columbia from the Atlantic coast is most desirable, and that the Department of Fisheries be requested to institute such means as will bring about this most desirable enterprise.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
*Chairman.*

24. That whereas the native oysters is found in some localities along the British Columbian coast, and as they are becoming rapidly decimated by the action of a few fishermen and Indians regardless of consequences, it is desirable that the Fisheries Department should take speedy action to prevent their extermination by establishing proper close seasons and encouraging persons who may be desirous of entering into the business of oyster culture.

Unanimously agreed to.

(Sd.) S. W.,  
*Chairman.*

The above sections, from 1 to 24, were duly considered by this Commission, and the records of their unanimous adoption, or otherwise, is agreed to by the Commissioners by their signatures which are hereto attached.

Witnessed by

(Sd.) CHARLES F. WINTER,  
*Secretary.*

(Sd.) SAML. WILMOT, *Chairman.*  
(Sd.) W. J. ARMSTRONG,  
(Sd.) D. W. HIGGINS.

New Westminster, B.C., 19th March, 1892.

True copy of original document.

CHARLES F. WINTER,  
*Secretary B. C. Fishery Commission.*

### MINORITY REPORT.

The following minority report was subsequently submitted by Mr. Commissioner Higgins :—

To the Honourable CHARLES H. TUPPER,  
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,  
Ottawa.

SIR,—As a member of the fishery commission which lately sat and took evidence in this province, I beg most respectfully to call your attention to the fact that on at least two essential points I am at variance with my brother commissioners. My objections are noted at the foot of the respective paragraphs in the finding of the commission.

Before proceeding to state these objections, I cannot refrain from expressing regret that much valuable information bearing on the ofal question was shut out by a majority vote of the commission, and consequently does not appear on the minutes of the proceedings. I felt the disappointment the more keenly for the reason that owing to official duties requiring my presence in the capital I was unable to be present when some of the evidence was taken. I have therefore been compelled to rely more particularly upon my own experience and observations and the evidence of medical men which I was fortunate enough to hear, to assist me in arriving at a conclusion as to the effects on the public health of the deposit of ofal in the rivers of the province.

## Marine and Fisheries.

In my opinion the medical testimony does not support Mr. Wilmot's report of 1890, nor does it justify the finding of a majority of the commission. As you will have an opportunity of examining that evidence for yourself, I shall not refer to it at greater length.

So far as my own observation went of the condition of things along the line of the slough at Lander's on the Fraser River, I am strongly of opinion that the several cases of typhoid which occurred there last year are attributable to the drinking of the slough water by the inhabitants, said water being poisoned by the drainage from closets, kitchens and stables situated along the banks. I had a map prepared of the slough and its surroundings. This map was laid before the commission at Vancouver, sworn to, and handed to Mr. Winter for incorporation with the minutes. Upon referring to this map you will observe that forty-five establishments, including two hotels, discharge their sewerage into this slough. It is worthy of remark that typhoid was most prevalent in 1891, and that during that season the Delta Company, which has its cannery at the mouth of the slough, deposited no offal in the river, but sent it away to an oilery to be converted into oil and manure. Only on one occasion during the season of 1891 did any offal reach the slough, and then by the accidental collapse of the cannery floor. This was quickly repaired, and no more went into the river from that cannery.

While the commission were at Lander's, I procured a bottle of water from the slough. The tide was out, and the specimen was an exceedingly fine one—for the purpose. In colour it resembled strong paragoni. After being closely corked for three or four days it emits a smell that is closely allied to decayed wood. In fact, the water flows from the peat marshes of the Fraser, and is rendered more injurious by the addition of sewerage from the forty-five establishments referred to above. As to its taste I can give no report, as I did not venture to taste it in that way, but Mr. Wilmot, who drank a small portion, pronounced it excellent. I would not venture to say that Mr. Wilmot's subsequent sickness could be attributed to that draught of slough water, but is a remarkable coincidence that, although in an excellent condition of health up to that time, upon my return to the river a week later I found him scarcely recovered from a severe attack of illness.

I submitted my bottle of slough water for analysis by the Government Analyst at Victoria, and his report will be found among the minutes in Mr. Winter's possession.

My conclusion is that the water, even in its natural state, is unfit for use. When invaded by the sewerage mentioned, it becomes positively dangerous to life and should not be drunk by man or beast. For the condition of public health along the slough, I think from the medical and other testimony and from personal enquiries, that the throwing of offal into the river is not responsible, at least at Lander's in the year 1891. I can well understand, however, that the deposit of offal in large quantities along the river banks is offensive to sight and smell, and cannot conduce to a good sanitary condition. But myriads of the fish after spawning in the tributaries of the main river die. Their bodies lie festering along the banks until they disappear by the gradual process of decay or are carried along by a sudden rise of the river to find a resting place at some other point. The late Mr. Mowat estimated that only from 5 to 25 per cent of the salmon that ascend the river to spawn return to the sea. Other authorities say that after a salmon has spawned it has performed its mission and dies at once.

I am aware that Mr. Wilmot, basing his opinion on the characteristics of salmon in eastern rivers, believes that the salmon here when not caught or destroyed by accident or exhaustion, return to salt water. My own observation extending over a period of nearly 34 years, leads me to the opinion that the habits of salmon of the Pacific coast are not identical with those on the Atlantic side, in this respect at least, and that few if any go back to the sea. However, it is admitted by all authorities that countless numbers die in the upper streams and it is not claimed that the presence of so much decaying matter in the water has an injurious effect on the health of the inhabitants. Such being the case and having in view my experience with Ladner's Slough water, I could not arrive at the same conclusion as my brother commissioners as to the evil effects of the deposit of offal in the river, although as a matter of precaution it should not be dumped near the shore but rather towed out in scows and deposited in the swift water of the river, the tremendous current of which in the course of a few hours will sweep

such portions as have not been devoured by scavenger fish into the salt water where it will speedily disappear. If the nets are occasionally fouled by the offal (and the evidence shows that they are) the loss will fall on the canners and not on the individual fishermen. As the spawning grounds are many miles above the canneries they cannot be contaminated by the deposit of offal in the river.

The enquiry had not long proceeded before I became impressed with the belief that the number of licenses issued should not be restricted: that all British subjects who applied should be granted licenses, and that no person not actually engaged in fishing, canning, or freezing should be licensed. This course, if adopted, will put an end to the traffic in licenses which has been carried on, and while the individual fishermen will be amply protected, the canner will not be at his mercy.

I do not agree with the majority in prohibiting the use of the seines at the mouths of all rivers, having been convinced by the evidence of experienced fishermen that on some of the northern streams (notably the Mimpkish River and Low and Rivers' Inlet) fish cannot be taken in any other way in sufficient numbers to make the business profitable. Stress has been laid on the fact that at Mimpkish last year only 600 cases were put up, and it has been attempted to be shown that the small catch is attributable to the use of the seine. But how is the catch of 1890 (the largest since fishing began on that river) accounted for, the seine having been used there for some ten or twelve years.

I am not in accord with my brother commissioners in their determination to fix all licenses at an uniform rate of \$20, believing that some consideration should be shown to the northern canneries where no hatcheries have been established and where no expense has been incurred by the government. On the Fraser River the government have made a large expenditure in propagating salmon and in protecting the fisheries and until similar steps have been taken on the northern rivers it seems scarcely fair that the license fee should be the same.

I submit that the present is not the time when onerous regulations should be placed on the cannery business in this province. It is at present passing through a severe crisis, and I speak from knowledge obtained from the best authorities, when I say that no money has been made for the past two years by those engaged in the pursuit. The outlook for a market too is decidedly gloomy and the competition with the Alaskan pack is so keen that should your department impose regulations that would add to the burthens of our fishermen, the result would be disastrous. At this moment I hear that in consequence of the bad state of the salmon market an agreement has been come to by the canners to pack only one-half the usual number of cases during the coming season. As some \$2,500,000 are invested in the business on Fraser River alone, I leave you to imagine the effect so short a pack will have on the trade of that part of the province.

It is to be regretted when we consider the magnitude of the interests involved that the scope of the inquiry was so limited, and that the time at the disposal of the Commission did not admit of a more extended and exhaustive investigation. It would be a still more regrettable circumstance if, as the outcome of the Commission, regulations should be imposed that would hamper the canners to an extent that would practically drive the product from the English market.

I know that I need not point out to you the necessity of fostering this most important industry, and that you are keenly alive to all that concerns the welfare and advancement of the various interests embraced in your department, and I feel sure that the matters upon which I have ventured to touch may be safely left with you to adjust on a basis which shall be fair to all.

In conclusion, I must place on record my unqualified admiration at the grand results that have attended the establishment of salmon hatcheries here, and cannot help expressing the hope that the usefulness of that important branch will be extended in every possible way, so that every stream in the province shall enjoy the benefits that would certainly flow from the adoption of this most enlightened policy.

I have the honour to be, sir, yours obediently,

(Sd.) D. W. HIGGINS.

Victoria, B.C., 29th March, 1892.