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## ABSTRACT

Peppar, J.L. and P.R. Pickard. 1978. Angling survey of the Cains River, Miramichi River system, New Brunswick, 1976. Fish. Mar. Serv. MS Rep. No. 1444:20 p.

An angling survey was conducted on the Cains River, Miramichi River system, New Brunswick, during the 1976 salmon angling season. Angling, especially on the Crown Open stretches, was monitored closely to assess overall angling quality. In addition to the collection of catch statistics, characteristics and interests of the anglers utilizing the resource were obtained through the use of a questionnaire.

Key words: "Crown Open", "Crown Reserve", creel census, angling quality, angling effort, harvest, scheduled waters, angler characteristics.

RESUME
Pepper, J.L. and P.R. Pickard. 1978. Angling survey of the Cains River, Miramichi River system, New Brunswick, 1976. Fish. Mar. Serv. MS Rep. No. 1444:20 p.

Une Etude de la pêche sportive sur la rivière cains, affluent de la rivière Miramichi, Nouveau-Brunswick, a été effectué durant la saison de pêche sportive au saumon de 1976. La pêche sportive, particulièrement dans les parties de la rivière dite "Libres de la Couronne", a été étroitement controlé afin doévaluer la qualité d'ensemble de la pêche. En plus de recueillir des statistiques sur les prises, on a obtenu, grace a un questionnaire, des données sur les caractéristiques et lintérét des pêcheurs sportifs utilisant la ressource.

Mots clés: "Libre de la Couronne". "Réservée de la Couronne", le dénombrement des prises, qualité de la pêche, l'effort de pêche, la prise, eaux règlementées, les charactéristiques des pêcheurs.

## INTRODUCTION

The Cains River is the major late-run tributary of the Southwest Miramichi River, New Brunswick (Fig.). Prior to 1971, angling for salmon on this river closed October 16. In 1971, additional angling restrictions were imposed throughout the Miramichi River system and, as a result, the salmon angling season on the Cains was shortened to September 15. This earlier closure was initiated because of low escapements of late-run salmon to the Cains las seen in decreasing juvenile salmon levels and low angling catches) and the desire to keep angling effort from increasing on this tributary, should other tributaries be closed earlier.

Since 1972, the year the total ban on commercial salmon fishing in the Miramichi was imposed, adult tagging studies have shown that a major portion of Cains River salmon enter the inner Miramichi estuary in July. Thus, in the years prior to 1972, these fish had been subjected to the commercial fishery even though they were not to enter the Cains until September or October. Because of this fact, then, the commercial closure allowed a higher escapement of salmon to the Cains than was originally estimated.

The Cains River has responded to the 1972 fishery restrictions; fry levels increased greatly and angling catches improved. An assessment of these factors after the 1975 season led to a recommendation to extend the salmon angling season on the Cains in 1976. A proposal for this extension was presented at the January 28 , 1976, meeting of the Miramichi River Salmon Management Advisory Committee. The adoption of this recommendation led to the inclusion of an angling survey of the Cains River in the Freshwater and Anadromous Division's 1976 salmon management investigations.

This report sumarizes results of the survey conducted over the period June 1September 30, the major portion of the angling season. Angling, especially on the Crown Open stretches, was monitored closely to assess overall angling quality and, particularly, effects of the extended season in terms of catch and effort. In addition to the collection of catch statistics, characteristics and interests of the anglers utilizing the resource were obtained through the use of a questionnaire.


## AREA OF STUDY

The mouth of the Cains River lies in Northumberland County, at $46^{\circ} 40^{\prime} \mathrm{N} ; 65^{\circ} 47 \mathrm{~W}$. The angling survey concentrated on three major areas: (1) Cains River mouth to Sabbies River mouth, (2) Shinnickburn to Six Mile Brook mouth, and (3) Grand Lake Road Bridge area.

## METHODS

A student assistant and a casual employee conducted the field portion of the survey. Censusing was conducted over the major portion of the angling season, June 1September 30.

Censusing consisted of: (1) surveying stretches of river by canoe, and censusing/ interviewing fishermen while they were on the water: and (2) travelling by truck to access points to the river, and censusing/ interviewing fishermen as they entered or left the water. These access points were rather limited and consisted primarily of the three areas indicated above.

Work schedules of the census clerks during the month of June did not allow full coverage of daylight hours on a seven-day week basis. However, beginning July 1 , schedules were arranged to ensure that at least one clerk was on duty each day of the week, including both clerks on every weekend. As many hours of daylight were :overed as possible, by staggering hours of nork each day (to enable coverage of the heavier angling periods of the morning and late afternoon/evening).

The daily field surveys were conducted by interviewing anglers and obtaining information pertaining to number of hours fished, and the number and weight of all fish caught. These data were recorded on creel-report forms (Appendices A and B) for later compilation and analysis. In addition, anglers were asked to verbally complete a questionnaire pertaining to their residence and angling interests (Appendix C).

Catch statistics from those private pools and fishing camps not covered during the daily field surveys were collected at the end of the season by obtaining camp records from owners or managers. These data were then added to those collected from the day-to-day field survey, and a total salmon-catch estimate was derived for the Cains River for the 1976 season.

## RESULTS

## FIELD SURVEY

Data presented in the following tables and analysis were derived from the field survey, and do not include data gathered at the end of the season from the fishing camps.

Weekly Salmon and Trout Harvest
In the survey, 655 anglers were interviewed, and weekly catches of salmon and trout over the duration of the 1976 season were summarized (Table 1). The total harvest of 126 salmon was comprised of $82 \%$ grilse and l8\% large salmon.

TABLE 1. Weekly salmon and trout harvest, Cains River (Miramichi River system), 1976.

| Period | Numbers of salmon |  |  | No. of trout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grilse | Large salmon | Totals |  |
| May 31-Jum 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Jun 7-13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Jun 14-20 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 58 |
| Jun 21-27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Jun 28-Jul 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Jul 5-11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Jul 12-18 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Jul 19-25 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Jul 26-Aug 1 | 12 | 2 | 14 | 3 |
| Aung 2-8 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 10 |
| Aug 9-15 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 0 |
| Aug 16-22 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Aug 23-29 | 9 | 1 | 10 | 5 |
| Aug 30-Sep 5 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 1 |
| Sep 6-12 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Sep 13-19 | 17 | 4 | 21 | 1 |
| Sep 20-26 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 0 |
| Sep 27-30 | 15 | 8 | 23 | 0 |
| Totals | $103{ }^{1}$ | $23^{2}$ | 126 | 146 |

${ }^{1} 42$ of 103 grilse were caught Septenber 16-30 inclusive.
${ }^{2} 15$ of 23 salman were caught Septenber 16-30 inclusive.

Grilse were angled from mid-July through to the end of the angling season; 418 of the total grilse catch was taken during September 16-30. The first large salmon was angled in mid-June; the majority were angled through August and September. September 16-30 accounted for 658 of the total large-salmon harvest. The 146 trout harvested were taken during the early part of the season (64\% during June).

## Salmon Angling Quality

Of the 655 anglers interviewed, 107 were successful in catching at least one grilse or large salmon (Table 2). This represents an average of 0.19 fish/angler, or 0.08 fish/hour fished.

Chronological Distribution of Salmon Harvest

Weekly catches and cumulative totals of salmon harvested over the season are summarized (Table 3). By the week of September 13-19, about $76 \%$ of the total grilse catch for the season had been recorded; whereas, only $52 \%$ of the large-
salmon stock had been taken by this time. Thus, during the last two weeks of September, a much greater proportion of large salmon than grilse was angled.
fished a total of 1,557 hours, with 538 of this effort expended during September. The estimated total numbers of hours fished by all anglers over the season was 2,069 .

TABLE 2. Salmon angling quality, Cains River (Miramichi River system), 1976.

| Period | Numbers of fish ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$ angled |  |  | Number of anglers interviewed | Successful anglers |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Totals per week | Average per hour fished | Average per angler |  |  |  |
| May 31-Jun 6 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 11 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Jun 7-13 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Jun 14-20 | 1 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 24 | 1 | 4.2 |
| Jun 21-27 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 7 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Jun 28-Jul 4 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Jul 5-11 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 28 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Jul 12-18 | 5 | 0.26 | 0.42 | 12 | 2 | 16.7 |
| Jul 19-25 | 3 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 21 | 3 | 14.3 |
| Jul 26-Aug 1 | 14 | 0.11 | 0.31 | 45 | 12 | 26.7 |
| Aug 2-8 | 10 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 40 | 8 | 20.0 |
| Aug 9-15 | 7 | 0.08 | 0.24 | 29 | 7 | 24.1 |
| Aug 16-22 | 4 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 42 | 4 | 9.5 |
| Aug 23-29 | 10 | 0.12 | 0.31 | 32 | 6 | 18.8 |
| Aug 30-Sep 5 | 13 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 77 | 12 | 15.6 |
| Sep 6-12 | 2 | 0.07 | 0.12 | 17 | 1 | 5.9 |
| Sep 13-19 | 21 | 0.10 | 0.26 | 80 | 18 | 22.5 |
| Sep 20-26 | 13 | 0.07 | 0.14 | 94 | 12 | 12.8 |
| Sep 27-30 | 23 | 0.11 | 0.29 | 78 | 21 | 26.9 |
| Totals | 126 | 0.08 | 0.19 | 655 | 107 | 16.3 |

${ }^{1}$ "Fish" denotes grilse and large salmon.

TABLE 3. Chronological distribution of salmon harvest, Cains River (Miramichi River system), 1976.

| Period | Numbers harvested |  | Cumulative totals |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Numbers of fish |  | Percent of harvest |  |
|  | Grilse | Large salmon | Grilse | Large salmon | Grilse | Large salmon |
| May 31-Jun 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jun 7-13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Jun 14-20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Jun 21-27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Jun 28-Jul 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Jul 5-11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Jul 12-18 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| Jul 19-25 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 4 |
| Jul 26-Aug 1 | 12 | 2 | 20 | 3 | 19 | 13 |
| Aug 2-8 | 10 | 0 | 30 | 3 | 29 | 13 |
| Aug 9-15 | 4 | 3 | 34 | 6 | 33 | 26 |
| Aug 16-22 | 4 | 0 | 38 | 6 | 37 | 26 |
| Aug 23-29 | 9 | 1 | 47 | 7 | 46 | 30 |
| Aug 30-Sep 5 | 12 | 1 | 59 | 8 | 57 | 35 |
| Sep 6-12 | 2 | 0 | 61 | 8 | 59 | 35 |
| Sep 13-19 | 17 | 4 | 78 | 12 | 76 | 52 |
| Sep 20-26 | 10 | 3 | 88 | 15 | 85 | 65 |
| Sep 27-30 | 15 | 8 | 103 | 23 | 100 | 100 |
| Totals | 103 | 23 | 103 | 23 |  |  |

## Summary of Angling Effort

Weekly effort data were also recorded
over the season (Table 4). A total of 871
anglers was observed on the Cains River
over the 1976 season. Of this total, 75\%
(655 anglers) were interviewed. They

TABLE 4. Summary of angling effort, Cains River (Miramichi River system), 1976.


## FISHING CAMP SURVEY

Not included in the above harvests were those catshes made entirely on some specific private-lease waters not covered or recorded by the angling survey. These statistics were gathered at the end of the season.

The total harvest recorded from these camps amounted to 134 grilse and 23 large salmon.

## ESTIMATE OF TOTAL SALMON HARVEST

The angling survey recorded catch and effort data from anglers primarily (not exclusively) using the open water areas of the Cains. Seventy-five percent of the anglers observed over the season were interviewed, and reported a harvest of 103 grilse and 23 large salmon. Thus, total harvest was estimated to be at least 168 salmon ( 137 grilse and 31 large salmon).

Therefore, including the total catch recorded from the fishing camps, the total estimated angling catch of salmon from the Cains in 1976 was 325 salmon ( 271 grilse and 54 large salmon).

## RESPONSE TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Use of the questionnaire was more limited than the general creel census forms because of the time involved in its adminis tration, and its use being a possible annoyance to any angler engaged in the act of fishing. The questionnaire was completed by 271 (418) of the 655 anglers interviewed.

Responses to the questionnaire have been compiled by question (Tables 5-18).

## Angler Residence

Resident anglers questioned came from 11 New Brunswick counties (Table 5), representing 4 cities, 5 towns, 13 villages and 19 communities (Table 6). The majority of these anglers came from Northumberland, Westmorland and York counties-mostly from the cities of Moncton and Fredericton, the town of Newcastle, and the village of Blackville.

Non-resident Americans and Canadians accounted for approximately $16 \%$ of the total number of anglers interviewed. Residence locations of these anglers were indicated as "non-resident" only, and not further broken down, as was done for the New Brunswick resident anglers.

TABLE 5. Question 1: Residence (county, non-resident) locations of anglers utilizing resource.

| Residence/location | Number of Percent of |
| :--- | :--- |
| (oounty/non-resident) | responses total response |


|  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Albert | 12 | 4.4 |
| Gloucester | 2 | 0.7 |
| Kent | 10 | 3.7 |
| Kings | 3 | 1.1 |
| Northumberland | 76 | 28.0 |
| Queens | 1 | 0.4 |
| Saint John | 3 | 1.1 |
| Sunbury | 4 | 1.5 |
| Victoria | 4 | 1.5 |
| Westmorland | 67 | 24.7 |
| York | 45 | 16.6 |
| Non-resident |  |  |
| -American | 86 | 13.0 |
| -Canadian | 271 | 3.0 |
| Total |  |  |

TABLE 6. Question 2: Residence (city, town, village, community, or non-resident) locations of anglers utilizing resource.

Number of $\begin{gathered}\text { Percent of } \\ \text { reaponses } \\ \text { total respanse }\end{gathered}$
(specific/non-resident)
City
Bathurst
Fredericton
Mancton
Saint Jom

## Town

Chatham
Marysville
Rewcastle
Oramocto
Shediac
Village
Aroostook
Blackville
Buctouche
Burtts Corner
Doaktown
Douglastown
Havelock
Minto
Nelson
Perth-Andover
Pogersville
Salisbury
Tracy
Commmity
Rasse-Aboujogane
Blissfield
Boiestown
Douglasfield
East Riverside
Gray Rapids
Harcourt
Ludlow
Millerton
$\star$ Nashwaak Village
Notre-Dame
Perniac
Quarryville
Ped Bank
Renous
Riverview
Taymouth
Upper Blackville
Williamsburg
Non-resident
-American -Canadian yotal

## \%.

Angler Interest in Sport Fishing
Approximately 70\% of the anglers questioned responded that they normally sport fish (anywhere) up to 30 days each year (Table 7).
questioned responded that they had fished, or intended to fish, at least five days on the Cains River in 1976 (Table 8).

TABLE 7. Question 3: How many days do you normally fish (anywhere) each year?

| Number of days <br> spent angling | Number of <br> responses | Percent of <br> total response |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $1-10$ | 66 | 25.2 |
| $11-20$ | 59 | 22.5 |
| $21-30$ | 58 | 22.1 |
| $31-40$ | 21 | 8.0 |
| $41-50$ | 17 | 6.5 |
| $51-60$ | 11 | 4.2 |
| $61-70$ | 4 | 1.5 |
| $71-80$ | 3 | 1.2 |
| $81-90$ | 1 | 0.4 |
| $91-100$ | 0 | 5.3 |
| $101-110$ | 5 | 0.0 |
| $111-120$ | 1 | 1.9 |
| $121-130$ | 1 | 0.4 |
| $131-140$ | 262 | 0.4 |
| $141-150$ |  | 0.4 |
| Total |  |  |

TABLE 8. Question 4: How many days do you plan to fish on the Cains River?

| Number of <br> angling days | Number of <br> responses | Percent of <br> total response |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| 1 | 39 | 14.4 |
| 2 | 54 | 20.0 |
| 3 | 30 | 11.1 |
| 4 | 25 | 9.3 |
| 5 | 33 | 12.2 |
| 6 | 11 | 4.1 |
| 7 | 8 | 3.0 |
| 8 | 4 | 1.5 |
| 10 | 25 | 9.3 |
| 12 | 6 | 2.2 |
| 14 | 10 | 3.3 |
| 15 | 7 | 2.7 |
| 20 | 1 | 0.6 |
| 21 | 4 | 1.5 |
| 25 | 2 | 0.7 |
| 30 | 1 | 0.4 |
| 50 | 1 | 0.4 |
| 63 | 270 |  |
| Total |  |  |

[^0]TABLE 9. Question 5: Have you fished the Cains River before?

| Response | Number of <br> responses | Percent of <br> total response |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | 198 | 73.1 |
| No | 73 | 26.9 |
| Total | 271 |  |

Anglers' Preferred Species and Type of Angler Utilizing the Resource

Seventy-seven percent of the anglers questioned stated that their most preferred species to catch was salmon, as opposed to trout and other species (Table 10). Seventy-five percent stated that they were on the cains to angle for salmon, as opposed to trout (Table ll). The majority of the anglers (66\%) considered themselves to be predominantly salmon anglers, as opposed to trout anglers or anglers for other species (Table 12).

TABLE 10. Question 6: What species of fish do you most prefer to catch?

| Response | Number of <br> responses | Percent of <br> total response |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Salmon | 208 | 77.0 |
| Trout | 59 | 21.9 |
| Salmon \& trout | 2 | 0.7 |
| Pickerel | 1 | 0.4 |
| Total | 270 |  |

TABLE 11. Question 7: What species of fish are you most interested in catching here?

|  | Number of <br> responses | Percent of <br> total response |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Response | 203 | 74.9 |
| Salmon | 66 | 24.4 |
| Trout | 2 | 0.7 |
| Salmon \& trout | 271 |  |

TABLE 12. Question 8: In your opinion, are you predominantly a salmon angler or a trout angler? Or other?

| Response | Number of <br> responses | Percent of <br> total <br> response |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Salmon | 179 | 66.0 |
| Trout | 77 | 28.4 |
| Salmon \& trout | 14 | 5.2 |
| Pickerel | 11 | 0.4 |
| Total | -271 |  |

## Type of Angling Conducted

Ninety-eight percent of the anglers questioned stated that they were fishing from the shoreline of the river, as opposed to fishing from a boat or canoe (Table 13). The majority ( $86 \%$ ) responded that they preferred this type of fishing, as opposed to fishing from a boat or canoe.

TABLE 13. Question 9: What type of fishing are you doing on this trip? What type do you prefer?

| Type of angling | Number of responses (doing) | Percent of total response | Number of responses (prefer) | Percent of total response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shoreline on river | 266 | 98.2 | 233 | 86.0 |
| Boat on river | 3 | 1.1 | 25 | 9.2 |
| Boat on lake | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.4 |
| Shoreline \& boat on river | 2 | 0.7 | 9 | 3.3 |
| No preference | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 1.1 |
| Totals | 271 |  | 271 |  |

Angler Interest in Status of the Water
The majority (72\%) of anglers questioned stated that they would like to see the Cains River "scheduled" during the salmon angling season (Table 14).

TABLE 14. Question 10: Do you feel that the Cains River should be "scheduled" during the salmon angling season (i.e., fly fishing only)? If yes, why? If no, why?

| Response | Number of <br> responses | Percent of <br> total response |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Yes | 196 | 72.3 |
| No opinion | 62 | 22.9 |
| No opinion | 13 | 4.8 |
| Total | 271 |  |

Predicted Angling Effort Should the Cains Be Scheduled

Ninety-four percent of the anglers questioned stated that they would continue to fish the Cains River should it become a scheduled river during the salmon angling season (Table 15).

TABLE 15. Question 11: If the Cains River should become a scheduled river; will you still continue to fish the river?

| Response | Number of <br> responses | Percent of <br> total response |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Yes | 255 | 94.1 |
| No opinion | 14 | 5.2 |
| No | 2 | 0.7 |
| Total | 271 |  |

## Other Areas Angled in New Brunswick

Fifty-four percent of the anglers questioned stated that they angled primarily in the Miramichi River system (Tablc 16). Responses were highly varied, as the question was too general.

Most Preferred Areas in New Brunswick to Angle

The majority of anglers questioned (75.68) stated that they most preferred angle in the Miramichi River system, as opposed to other areas in New Brunswick (Table 17).

## Predicted Angling Effort on Cains River for Next Year

the Cains River in 1977 (Table 18).

TABLE 16. Question 12: Where else do you angle in New Brunswick?

| River system or locality | Number of responses | Percent of total respanse |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Miramichi | 147 | 54.2 |
| Saint John | 8 | 3.0 |
| Nepisiguit | 1 | 0.4 |
| Tabusintac | 1 | 0.4 |
| Salmon | 1 | 0.4 |
| Richibucto | 1 | 0.4 |
| Canam | 1 | 0.4 |
| Miramichi \& Saint John | 30 | 11.1 |
| Miramichi \& Pestigouche | 1 | 0.4 |
| Miramichi \& Mepisiguit | 1 | 0.4 |
| Miramichi \& Richibucto | 1 | 0.4 |
| Miramichi \& Salmon | 1 | 0.4 |
| Miramichi \& Canaan | 1 | 0.4 |
| Miramichi \& Tabusintac | 1 | 0.4 |
| Saint John \& Kouchibouguac | c 1 | 0.4 |
| Richibucto \& Salmon | 1 | 0.4 |
| Miramichi, Saint John Restigouche | 4 | 1.5 |
| Miramichi, Saint John \& Big Salman | 1 | 0.4 |
| Miramichi, Saint Jokn \& Salmon | 1 | 0.4 |
| Miramichi, Saint John \& Fammond | 1 | 0.4 |
| Saint John, Pestigouche $\&$ Pokemouche | 1 | 0.4 |
| Miramichi, Nepisiguit $\&$ Jacquet | 1 | 0.4 |
| Nepisiguit, Salman $\&$ Gaspereau | 1 | 0.4 |
| Other localities -non-specific | 53 | 19.6 |
| Nowhere | 10 | 4.0 |
| Total | 271 |  |

TABLE 17. Question 13: Where in New Brunswick do you most prefer to angle?

| River system <br> or locality | Number of <br> responses | Percent of <br> total response |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Miramichi | 204 |  |
| Saint John | 15 | 75.6 |
| Restigouche | 7 | 5.6 |
| Nepisiguit | 3 | 2.6 |
| Tabusintac | 1 | 0.1 |
| Salmon | 2 | 0.4 |
| Richibucto | 1 | 0.7 |
| Canaan | 1 | 0.4 |
| Bass \& Molus | 1 | 0.4 |
| Allsalmon rivers | 1 | 0.4 |
| Anywhere, |  | 12.6 |
| not-specific | 34 |  |
| Total | 270 |  |

TABLE 18. Question 14: Do you plan to fish the Cains again next year?

Response \begin{tabular}{c}
Number of <br>
responses

 

Percent of <br>
total response
\end{tabular}

|  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Yes | 257 | 94.8 |
| No opinion | 1 | 0.4 |
| No | 13 | 4.8 |
| Total | 271 |  |

## DISCUSSION

The angling season on the Cains River in 1976 was extended two weeks (September 16-30) over that previously allowed since 1971. In terms of the salmon catch as recorded by the angling survey, this 2-week period accounted for $65 \%$ of the total largesalmon catch, and 41\% of the total grilse catch. Thus, inclusion of this 2-week period into the 1976 angling season was an important factor in the overall salmon angling quality recorded for the season.

In terms of number of hours fished, the effort expended over the 2 -week extension to the season was almost double that expended over the first half of September. An increase in angling effort over this period was expected, as it was assumed that many anglers would choose to fish the Cains once angling on other rivers closed September 15 .

The total bright salmon catch for the Cains River in 1976 was estimated to be at least 325 fish ( 271 grilse and 54 large salmon). This figure is the best estimate of total catch; i.e., it includes catches from the "open waters" and the private "leased waters". The proportion of grilse and large salmon (83\% grilse, 17\% large salmon) closely approximates that recorded at the Millbank sampling trap over the season ( $84 \%$ grilse, 168 large salmon).

Angling statistics for the Cains River, as for the rest of the Miramichi River system, are generally supplied by field personnel of the Field Services Branch (Conservation and Protection Division). The 1976 catch for the Cains River, as estimated by our angling survey (271 grilse and 54 large salmon), compares with catches over the 1970-76 period as supplied by the Conservation and Protection Division as follows:

|  | No. of bright salmon caught |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Grilse | Large salmon | Totals |
| 1970 | 258 | 49 | 307 |
| $1971^{1}$ | - | - | - |
| 1972 | 1,135 | 425 | 1,560 |
| 1973 | 150 | 103 | 253 |
| 1974 | 246 | 162 | 408 |
| 1975 | 22 | 8 | 30 |
| 1976 | 101 | 124 | 225 |

[^1]The 1976 angling catch estimated from our survey contrasts rather strongly with the estimate of catch as supplied by the Conservation and Protection Division. The difference between estimates is most apparent in the reported grilse:large-salmon ratio of the catches. Large salmon comprised only $17 \%$ of the total angling catch, as recorded by our survey; whereas, Conservation and Protection reported that large salmon comprised $55 \%$ of the total catch. Both the anglers interviewed and the camps covered had angling catches of grilse in excess of the numbers reported by Conservation and Protection; neither recorded large-salmon catches in the magnitude indicated the Conservation and Protection statistics.

In terms of total catch, and disregarding the discrepancy in grilse:largesalmon ratio of catch, the 1976 catch approximates catches reported for 1973 and 1974. Thus, despite the extended season and its corresponding increase in angling effort, the 1976 catch did not show a corresponding increase over previous catches during the 1972-75 period.

There is no doubt that the season extension provided for better salmon angling on the Cains River (especially large salmon). However, even though the angling catch did not increase greatly over preceding seasons (with the exception of the extremely poor 1975 season), it is felt that the overall low level of late-run stocks noted at the Millbank sampling trap in 1976 would preclude any further relaxation of restrictions on the Cains River angling season at this time.

Responses to the questionnaire indicated that the majority of the anglers interviewed (75\%) were on the Cains River to angle for salmon, as opposed to trout. When asked whether they would favor scheduling of the Cains during the salmon season, 72\% of the total anglers interviewed stated that they were in favor of scheduling. And an even higher majority (948) stated that they would still continue to fish the Cains should it become a scheduled river.

Those anglers favoring scheduling did so primarily for the following reasons: that scheduling provides better protection, conservation and preservation of the salmon resource; provides for better control of illegal fishing activities; and promotes fly fishing (considered as "art" by many salmon anglers). Those opposing scheduling of the Cains cited the following reasons: that spin fishing is enjoyed by many anglers, especially those anglers fishing for trout; the laterrun timing of salmon to the Cains prevents any serious damage to salmon from spin and bait fishing methods; and the dark water of the Cains River reduces the threat of jigging for salmon.

Overall, angling on the Cains River in 1976 was popular, and attracted anglers from all over the province of New Brunswick. A very high majority of these
anglers (95\% of those interviewed) stated that they intend to fish the Cains again in 1977. The season extension provided for a great deal of this interest and the result, as recorded by the survey, did not indicate any increase in harvest to seriously affect spawning escapement to the river. This factor will be assessed in juvenile popula-tion-assessment studies to be conducted throughout the Cains in 1977.
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## CREEL CENSUS DATA




TOTAL NUMBER OF ANGLERS IN SECTION: $\qquad$

COMMENTS:

## Creel Questionnaire: Cains River.

Date:
Location:

1. Residence (county):
2. Residence (city, town, village):
3. How mary days do you normally fish (anywhere) each year? $\qquad$
4. How many days do you plan to fish on the Cains River
this yoar?
5. Ilave you fished the Cains River before?
6. What species of fish do you most prefer to catch?
7. What species of fish are you most interested in catching here?
8. In your opinion, are you predominai.tly a salmon angler or a trout angler?
or other?
9. What type of fishing are you doing on this trip?

What type do you prefer?
Doing
Prefer
shoreline on river
boat (canoe) on river $\qquad$
other
10. Do you feel that the Cains River should be "scheduled" during the salmon angling season (ie., fly fishing only)? If yes, why? $\qquad$ If: no, why?
11. If the Cains River should become a scheduled river will you still continue to fish the river?
12. Where else do you angle in New Brunswick? $\qquad$
13. Where in N.B. do you most prefer to angle?
14. Do you plan to fish the Cains again next year?


[^0]:    Past Angling Experience on the Cains River
    Seventy-three percent of the anglers questioned stated that they had fished the Cains River prior to 1976 (Table 9).

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ No statistics available.

