

FISHERIES &

MARINE SERVICE

TRANSLATION

SERIES NO

111

**FISHERIES RESEARCH BOARD
OF CANADA**

MANUSCRIPT REPORTS OF THE BIOLOGICAL STATIONS

No.

489

Title

A study of the commercial fishery of Great Slave Lake, N.W.T.
during the summer season of 1949

Author

W. A. Kennedy, L. C. Hewson and L. J. Stephen

Central Fisheries Research Station

January, 1951

INTRODUCTION

The study of the summer commercial fishery of Great Slave Lake which was begun in 1946 by the Fisheries Research Board of Canada was continued in 1949. Lake trout, Cristivomer namaycush, and lake whitefish, Coregonus clupeaformis were the principle species involved. Since the buyers were no longer required to buy inconnu, Stenodus leucichthys mackenzii, they were generally discarded, although a few inconnu and yellow pike-perch, Stizostedion vitreum vitreum were sold.

The methods of collecting data remained the same as in former years. The statistical subdivisions used in this report are those defined in the 1948 report and the various conversion factors are also the same.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In addition to the two junior authors, data were collected by D. C. Gibson, S. Haynes, and A. L. MacDonald. The excellent co-operation of the various fishermen and of the various fish buyers is greatly appreciated.

THE HAY RIVER FISHERY

Previous to 1948 only one fish company, McInnes Products Corporation Limited, operated in the summer on Great Slave Lake. Their base was at Gros Cap on the north shore of the lake and,

since their product was frozen and shipped by reefer barges, they were independent of road transportation.

In 1948 when the new road to Hay River was opened other companies began fishing there. This operation was negligible in 1948 but in 1949 it became an important factor in the fishery.

The 1949 summer fishery at Hay River was conducted by five fish companies: W. R. Menzies (17 boats), Clark Fisheries (8 boats), Gateway Fisheries (4 boats), Alaska Fisheries (6 boats) and Inland Fisheries (7 boats). These companies all shipped fresh fish by truck to the railhead at Grimshaw, Alberta over the new road.

The most prevalent type of boat used was one built originally to fish on Lesser Slave Lake. They were from 28 to 32 feet long with a seven-foot beam. The fish holds were generally forward and there was usually a small deck house which, in some cases, had bunks built in. Most of them were driven by Easthope two cylinder 10-horsepower gasoline motors and made 8 to 10 miles per hour. They were steered by tiller or in a few cases by a wheel.

The next most common type was the "Riverton Boat", a type that is used extensively on Lake Winnipeg, 40 feet long with a 14-foot beam. They were all driven by Gray Marine 30-horsepower, 6 cylinder gasoline motors, except one which had a Packard motor, and made 10 to 12 miles per hour. They had deck houses and could be steered either by tiller or by wheel. The fish holds were forward.

3

Some boats brought from the Pacific coast were also used. They were built originally by Japanese-Canadians and were referred to as the "Jap" boats. They were about 35 feet long with a 7-foot beam. They were equipped with deck houses and had two bunks and the decking forward. The fish holds were aft. They were driven by 3 cylinder Easthope motors of about 25-horsepower and made about 8 miles per hour.

In addition, there were various nondescript boats with makeshift deckhouses powered by various types of motor.

Some fish were landed at Hay River as early as June 18 although the companies did not encourage the fishermen to fish because of the poor condition of the road. Intensive fishing began on June 28 in the immediate vicinity of Hay River and lasted until July 13 when the quota for that vicinity was exhausted. All the companies then set up camp south of Cranberry Island in Windy Bay with the exception of Inland Fisheries which set up a camp at Moraine Point.

These camps consisted mainly of barges (one barge for each company) on which the fish were dressed, iced, and packed for shipment to Hay River. The fishermen lived in tents ashore or aboard their boats.

Fishing was spasmodic during the latter part of July. The fishermen were reluctant to lift their nets in the winds that prevailed. On July 30 fishing was temporarily discontinued because the road became impassable because of rains. On August 8, W. R. Menzies resumed operations and Clark Fisheries began a week later.

4

The other companies did not fish during the rest of the summer. On August 15 the road once more became impassable and at the same time the quota for the area being fished was exhausted, so fishing again ceased.

On August 28, W. R. Menzies and Clark Fisheries moved their barges to a small bay off Long Island. From this base they fished in "Area III" until September 15.

Throughout the whole summer the companies had difficulties in freighting their fish. The smaller companies used their bigger fishing boats for freighters while the bigger companies contracted for the services of some small freight boats which have been on the lake for several years. All the boats used for freighting were too small to travel in some of the winds encountered during the latter part of August, and in some cases quantities of fish spoiled and were discarded.

By the time that W. R. Menzies and Clark Fisheries moved to Long Island they both had their own freighters. These freighters were modified Riverton Boats, with the same hull pattern but slightly greater length and beam. They were more useful for freighting than those used up to that date. To supplement them, Clark Fisheries hired two other boats, the "Guy" and the "Pilot II". It developed motor trouble frequently.

The supply of ice was a problem except when they were actually fishing out of Hay River. The ice had to be transported from Hay River to the various barges by the freighters, and on many occasions fish had to be left uniced until a freighter arrived.

The nets used were all 100 yards long, of 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch mesh (stretched measure), generally of cotton or linen but rarely of nylon, and of various twine sizes. They were from 22 to 80 meshes deep, mostly 30 or 40 meshes. They were generally set three nets to a gang but sometimes gangs of 2 to 4 nets were set.

THE GROS CAP FISHERY

McInnes Products continued operating as in previous years except that between July 18 and August 16 seven of the boats usually based at Gros Cap were based at Caribou Bay. They had an ice house at Caribou Bay and packed fish there after which they were freighted to Hay River as fresh fish. McInnes Products fishermen used 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch mesh nets, 30 meshes deep, and generally of 30/6 twine although some 35/6 twine was used.

SIZE COMPOSITION OF THE CATCH

Samples were taken from the catch to determine the average size of individual commercial fish in the same way as was outlined in the 1948 report. No inconnu were included in the 1949 samples.

Lake trout

A total of 5,349 lake trout were included in the samples. The average weight in each sample with its standard error (Snedecor 1946) is shown in Table I. The frequency distributions of weights in the various samples are shown in Table II.

There was a tendency for the average size of lake trout to decrease from Area E to Area M. This tendency has been noted in previous reports. A tendency for the average size to decrease from Area E to Area A was apparent in 1949 for the first time. Data were not available previously since Areas A and D were not fished in previous summers.

Average size tended to increase throughout the summer. This is in contrast to previous years when the average size decreased during the summer. This reversal is apparently the result of the inclusion of the new fishing grounds since the impression of a decrease in size with time was based mainly on a series of samples from Areas F, G, H, K and M, none of which were well represented by the 1949 samples.

There is no indication that the average size of lake trout has changed since 1945.

Whitefish

A total of 7,921 whitefish were included in the samples. The average weight in each sample and its standard error is shown in Table III. The frequency distributions of individual weights in the various samples are shown in Table IV.

The inclination for the average size of whitefish to increase from west to east as noted in previous reports was again apparent. It did not change noticeably during the season.

The average size of whitefish may have increase slightly at some places since 1945 but the apparent differences are so small

that they may represent inadequate sampling. If there actually has been an increase in average size, it probably has been the result of fishing a little deeper each year.

CATCH

Commercial fish

In 1949 Fisheries Research Board personnel were able to record the total amount of fish caught by fishermen that were based at Gros Cap. These data were taken from the weights as recorded by the McInnes Products Corporation and were converted to found weight as caught, (i.e. before the "shrinkage" allowance was made) by the use of the factors tabulated in the 1948 report. Since the McInnes Products Corporation records show the weight of fish landed by each fisherman daily, and since information on the location of nets was gathered by interviewing the fishermen daily, the amount taken during each half-month in each area was determined exactly. The amounts of fish caught but not landed (which, therefore, never appeared on the McInnes Products Corporation's books) were estimated as described in the 1948 report, and were added to the converted recorded catches to give the actual amount of fish caught.

In the case of the fishermen that were not based at Gros Cap, it was not possible to interview each man daily. About one-half of the summer's catch made by these fishermen was made by the ones who were interviewed daily. The data for these catches were treated in the same way as the Gros Cap data.

An estimate of the catches that were made by fishermen who were not interviewed was possible, since the Dominion Department of Fisheries officers kept records of the total catches by weeks. The discrepancy between the totals reported by them, and the totals (before correction) of the fish taken by the fishermen who were interviewed must represent the recorded catches of the fishermen who were not interviewed. The catches that were made by the non-interviewed fishermen were presumed to come from Areas A, D and E (the only areas that were fished by fishermen who were not based at Gros Cap) in the same proportion as the catches that were made by the fishermen who were interviewed. The fishermen who were not interviewed were assumed to discard the same proportion of their catch as those that were interviewed. It was, therefore, possible to make reasonable estimates of the actual amount of fish caught by this group of fishermen in each area during each half month.

Table V shows what proportion of the estimated total amount of fish caught was actually landed by the fishermen who were interviewed, what proportion was landed by the other fishermen, and what proportion was caught but not weighed in. A small proportion of the latter was used by the fishermen to feed their families and dogs, but most of it represents wasted fish. The noticeable increase in amounts of wasted fish as compared with former years was mainly because of fish from Area E which spoiled while waiting without ice for transportation to Hay River. Nets that were left in the water for more than two nights accounted for most of the remaining waste.

Tables VI, VII and VIII show the respective total catches of lake trout, whitefish and of the two combined at various times and places. These values are the estimated total quantities of fish removed from the lake, whether they were marketed or not. The last half-month period is from September 1-16 because about 8,000 pounds were landed on September 16.

Rough Fish

From information supplied by the fishermen, the amount of rough fish taken in each fishing area was estimated. The estimated totals are shown in Table IX. These totals have been adjusted to allow for the fact that some fishermen were not interviewed. Fishermen reported taking the following species of rough fish: inconnu, Stenodus leucichthys mackenzii, cisco, (locally known as tullibee) Leucichthys spp., burbot, Lota lota, pike, Esox lucius, suckers, Catostomus catostomus (common) and Catostomus commersonii (rare), yellow pikeperch, Stizostedion vitreum vitreum, American grayling, Thymallus signifer and round whitefish Prosopium cylindraceum quadrilaterale.

In previous reports inconnu were recorded as commercial fish. In 1949 the buyers were not required to buy inconnu, as they previously had been, and as a result, most of them were discarded. They are, therefore, listed here as rough fish. About 30,000 pounds of inconnu so recorded were reported by the Gros Cap fishermen who reported 90,000 pounds in 1948, 64,000 in 1947 and 130,000 in 1946. This low estimate as compared with former observations suggests that all estimates of discarded fish may be low.

"Black whitefish" were generally treated as commercial fish in 1949, in contrast to the 1948 practice of rigidly culling them. They are, therefore, not listed here as rough fish. The few that were culled because they were "black" have been recorded as discarded commercial fish.

Considerably more rough fish were caught in the summer of 1949 than in previous years. This is not surprising since the catch of commercial fish more than doubled. Exclusive of inconnu, about 90,000 pounds of rough fish were reported by the Gros Cap fishermen. This quantity is comparable with the 227,000 pounds of rough fish taken in 1948, the 173,000 pounds taken in 1947 and the 117,000 pounds taken in 1946. The low value for 1949 suggests that the underestimation of discarded fish may be a characteristic of the 1949 sample at Gros Cap only.

FISHING EFFORT

The unit of fishing effort used in this paper is the effort exerted by one gill-net which lifted daily. The fishing effort exerted by nets that are lifted after other intervals can be made comparable with the fishing effort exerted by nets that are actually lifted daily by the use of the factors given in the 1948 report. By the use of these factors all fishing effort can be converted to "equivalent net-nights" which is defined in the 1948 report. The fishing effort exerted by one "equivalent net-night" is the same as the fishing effort exerted by one gill-net that is lifted daily at the same time and place.

Table X shows the fishing efforts exerted by the fishermen who were actually interviewed. The fishing effort actually exerted in Areas A, D, and E was about twice as great as Table X indicates. The comparatively small fishing effort in Areas G, H, and K is remarkable in view of the fact that these were the original fishing grounds, and that fishermen from Gros Cap must pass over them to get to the grounds that they fished in the summer of 1949.

AVAILABILITY

In this paper availability is defined as the catch in pounds ground weight, produced per unit of fishing effort in equivalent net-nights. It is based entirely on the catch and effort of fishermen who were actually interviewed. Availabilities based on the 1949 summer data are shown in Tables XI, XII, and XIII. In general, availabilities were slightly lower than in previous years. This could be interpreted as the result of a decrease in abundance produced by the fishery. However, in the past, availabilities have fluctuated enough that this apparent decrease can tentatively be regarded as a deviation from the norm. Variations in availability with time and place within the season followed much the same pattern as that outlined in previous reports.

Tables XIV, XV and XVI show the availabilities that can be calculated where the fishermen that were interviewed lifted daily. As pointed out in the 1948 report, these values are probably not as useful as the values given in Tables XI, XII and XIII.

DEPTHS FISHED

Ranges in depths fished are shown in Table XVII. The extreme values have been eliminated as described in the 1948 report.

Although comparisons are difficult, it would appear that, in general, fishermen did not fish quite as deep in 1949 as in 1948.

RELATED DATA

As in previous years scale samples were taken, tags that were returned from fish that were tagged in 1946 and 1947 were collected, and meteorological and limnological data were collected. These studies will be reported elsewhere.

DISCUSSION

There has been no significant change in average size or in availability of commercial fish since the fishery on Great Slave Lake began. In other words, neither of these important indices indicate excessive exploitation. A study of the age distribution as determined from the scales that have been collected (not analysed here) further corroborates this opinion.

A limited area near Windy Point was fished intensively during the summer of 1949. This intensive fishery will probably produce a local depletion of fish in this area within the next two years, although no evidence of such depletion is apparent from the data at hand. This local depletion is not likely to be serious.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The data analysed above do not suggest any recommendations other than those that have been made in previous reports.

Table I. The average size of lake trout in pounds round weight and its standard error in samples taken at random from the fish landed by commercial fishermen from Great Slave Lake during the summer season of 1949. The number of fish in each sample is shown in brackets.

Area	June 16-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-15
A	8.0±0.4 (132)	10.5±0.2 (503)	-	-	-	-
D	-	-	11.3±0.3 (491)	9.9±0.4 (205)	-	-
E	8.2±0.3 (217)	10.3±0.2 (592)	14.7±0.4 (334)	9.2±0.3 (325)	-	-
F	-	10.0±0.6 (118)	8.1±0.5 (209)	-	-	-
G	-	-	-	-	8.6±0.6 (115)	5.4±0.1 (383)
K	-	6.0±0.2 (67)	-	-	-	-
L	-	6.0±0.1 (271)	7.1±0.2 (346)	7.3±0.3 (153)	8.6±0.3 (170)	-
M	-	-	-	5.8±0.2 (48)	8.7±0.3 (293)	8.4±0.2 (377)

Table II The frequency distribution of round weights of lake trout in samples taken at random from the fish landed by commercial fishermen from Great Slave Lake during the summer of 1949.

Wt. in lbs.	Area A		Area D		July 1-15	Area E		Aug. 16-31	Area F	
	June 16-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15		July 16-31	Aug. 1-15		July 1-15	July 16-31
1		2			1	2				
2		4			8	8				
3		13			11	15				
4		25			10	20				
5	21	51	43		39	51				
6	31	47	35		27	72				
7	14	46	40		22	68				
8	12	30	35		18	51				
9	10	37	39		23	28				
10	6	43	36		20	45				
11	10	35	32		11	31				
12	4	27	36		5	29				
13	6	29	25		2	24				
14	3	19	19		2	24				
15	3	13	22		4	25				
16	1	14	9		0	9				
17	2	8	14		1	17				
18	1	9	13		2	19				
19	1	8	8		0	15				
20	1	8	6		1	12				
21	1	7	11		0	3				
22	1	6	7		0	8				
23	1	6	6		0	3				
24	1	5	4		0	3				
25	1	5	4		2	0				
26	1	4	4		0	1				
27	1	4	4		1	1				
28	1	2	2		2	0				
29	1	5	0		2	0				
30	1	2	1		0	0				
31	1	1	3		1	2				
32	1	1	1		1	0				
33	1	1	1		1	0				
34	1	1	1		1	0				
35	1	1	1		1	0				
36	1	1	1		1	0				
37	1	1	1		1	0				
38	1	1	1		1	0				
39	1	1	1		1	0				
40	1	1	1		1	0				
41	1	1	1		1	0				
42	1	1	1		1	0				
43	1	1	1		1	0				
44	1	1	1		1	0				

Table II. (Cont'd.)

Wt. in lbs.	Area G		Area K	Area L		Area M				
	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-15	July 1-15	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-15
1										
2			1	1	1					
3		1	0	0	2					
4	11	39	2	14	11	8		1	12	3
5	30	84	22	89	76	36		6	47	2
6	23	62	23	107	112	42		7	52	2
7	12	39	14	32	74	18		6	40	12
8	4	10	3	12	24	18		1	38	54
9	2	7	0	5	10	10		5	24	33
10	0	7	2	4	5	3		0	16	31
11	0	2	.	3	3	3		0	6	18
12	0	0	.	2	3	3		0	4	10
13	7	0	.	1	3	5		1	2	4
14	3	1	.	1	4	1		1	9	3
15	4	2	.	1	3	1		1	8	7
16	2	0	.	1	3	0		1	4	4
17	4	0	.	1	1	2		2	4	4
18	1	1	.	1	3	1		4	4	6
19	0	1	.	1	0	0		4	4	1
20	0	0	.	1	3	0		2	2	1
21	0	0	.	1	0	0		4	1	0
22	2	0	.	1	0	0		0	1	0
23	0	1	.	1	0	0		0	1	0
24	0	0	.	1	0	0		0	1	0
25	0	0	.	1	0	0		0	0	0
26	0	0	.	1	0	0		0	1	0
27	0	0	.	1	0	2		0	2	0
28	0	0	.	1	0	0		0	0	0
29	0	0	.	1	0	0		0	0	0
30	0	1	.	1	0	0		0	0	0
31	0	1	.	1	0	0		0	0	0
32	2	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
33	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
34	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
35	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
36	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
37	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
38	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
39	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
40	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
41	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
42	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
43	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0
44	1	1	.	1	1	1		0	1	0

Table III. The average size of whitefish in pounds round weight and its standard error in samples taken at random from the fish landed by commercial fishermen from Great Slave Lake during the summer season of 1949. The number of fish in each sample is shown in brackets.

Area	June 16-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-15
A	2.8±0.06 (149)	3.1±0.03 (609)	-	-	-	-
D	-	-	3.2±0.03 (599)	3.3±0.03 (517)	-	-
E	-	3.0±0.02 (646)	2.8±0.02 (715)	2.9±0.02 (333)	2.7±0.03 (697)	-
F	-	2.9±0.03 (255)	3.0±0.02 (683)	-	-	-
G	-	-	2.9±0.02 (517)	-	-	-
K	-	3.7±0.03 (518)	4.1±0.11 (128)	-	-	-
L	-	-	3.4±0.02 (666)	3.5±0.04 (301)	3.3±0.04 (142)	-
M	-	-	-	-	4.1±0.05 (446)	-

Table V. An analysis of estimated catches in calculated round weights taken by the commercial fishery in Great Slave Lake during the summer season of 1949.

	Trout	Whitefish	Combined
Estimated total catch in thousands of pounds.....	3,012	2,325	5,337
Percentage landed by fishermen the location and number of whose nets were known.....	74.2	78.1	75.8
Percentage landed by other fishermen	19.9	15.6	18.1
Percentage caught but not landed....	5.9	6.3	6.1

Table VI. The estimated catches of lake trout, in thousands of pounds round weight taken by the commercial fishery in Great Slave Lake during the summer season of 1949... Any discrepancies in totals are the result of rounding off.

Area	June 15-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-16	All Summer
A	43	217	-	-	-	3	263
D	-	33	474	292	83	-	882
E	44	109	133	120	87	316	810
F	5	37	34	1	38	65	180
G	15	5	3	4	4	17	47
H	2	3	3	-	17	19	43
K	20	43	12	3	14	11	103
L	-	31	59	72	138	23	323
M	-	-	21	62	166	130	360
Whole lake	128	477	720	555	548	584	3,012

Table VII. The estimated catches of whitefish in thousands of pounds, round weight taken by the commercial fishery in Great Slave Lake during the summer season of 1949. Any discrepancies in totals are the result of rounding off.

Area	June 15-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-16	All Summer
A	40	235	-	-	-	2	278
D	-	23	320	290	69	-	702
E	59	127	117	133	77	136	650
F	8	137	111	1	12	7	276
G	13	3	2	1	1	2	23
H	1	1	2	-	2	7	13
K	27	83	16	1	5	5	138
L	-	21	24	44	67	16	173
M	-	-	-	12	31	30	72
Whole lake	149	632	592	481	266	205	2,325

Table VIII. The estimated catches of lake trout and whitefish combined in thousands of pounds round weight taken by the commercial fishery in Great Slave Lake during the summer season of 1949. Any discrepancies in totals are the result of rounding off.

Area	June 15-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-16	All Summer
A	83	452	-	-	-	6	541
D	-	56	794	582	152	-	1,584
E	103	236	250	253	165	452	1,460
F	13	174	145	1	50	72	455
G	28	8	4	5	6	19	70
H	3	4	5	-	19	26	57
K	47	126	29	4	19	16	241
L	-	52	83	116	205	39	496
M	-	-	2	74	197	159	433
Whole lake	277	1,109	1,312	1,036	813	789	5,337

Table IX. The estimated catches of rough fish in thousands of pounds round weight taken by the commercial fishery in Great Slave Lake during the summer season of 1949. The "others" consist of 98.3 per cent suckers, 1.4 per cent pike perch, 0.1 per cent grayling and 0.2 per cent round whitefish. Any discrepancies in totals are the result of rounding off.

Area	Inconnu	Cisco	Burbot	Pike	Others	All species
A	48	10	11	2	29	99
D	28	78	44	11	2	163
E	18	19	6	3	1	47
F	5	9	8	2	11	34
G	7	1	5	+	+	14
H	2	1	2	1	+	7
K	5	6	15	3	+	29
L	2	+	3	1	+	7
M	1	1	2	+	+	4
Whole lake	116	125	97	24	44	405

Table X. The fishing effort in equivalent net-nights (see text for definition) exerted in Great Slave Lake by the fishermen who were interviewed during the summer season of 1949.

Area	June. 15-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-16	All Summer
A	503	5,008	-	-	-	-	5,511
D	-	445	5,643	1,747	799	-	8,635
E	763	1,491	1,241	1,484	740	429	6,147
F	135	1,279	1,288	30	536	824	4,092
G	399	146	98	123	92	353	1,211
H	76	78	18	-	277	525	974
K	612	1,289	312	39	225	181	2,658
L	-	418	687	1,007	1,996	483	4,590
M	-	-	75	731	2,224	1,562	4,592
Whole lake	2,487	10,155	9,362	5,161	6,887	4,357	38,410

Table XI. The availability of lake trout in pounds round weight caught per equivalent net-night (see text for definition) to the fishermen who were interviewed during the summer season of 1949. An asterisk indicates a value based on less than 200 net-nights.

Area	June 15-31	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-16	All Summer
A	51	42	-	-	-	-	43
D	-	60	49	44	70	-	50
E	57	73	107	81	111	71	84
F	36*	29	27	32*	71	79	44
G	37	35*	29*	32*	46*	47	39
H	28*	35*	136*	-	61	37	45
K	32	33	40	76*	64	62*	39
L	-	74	86	72	69	47	70
M	-	-	27*	85	75	83	78
Whole lake	45	46	56	66	75	68	58

Table XII. The availability of whitefish in pounds round weight caught per equivalent net-night (see text for definition) to the fishermen who were interviewed during the summer season of 1949. An asterisk indicates a value based on less than 200 net-nights.

Area	June 15-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-15	All Summer
A	54	47	-	-	-	-	47
D	-	46	35	48	59	-	40
E	77	85	94	90	98	58	87
F	59*	107	86	17*	23	9	67
G	32	23*	16*	10*	14*	6	19
H	12*	13*	132*	-	8	13	14
K	44	65	42	24*	22	26*	51
L	-	51	35	44	34	34	38
M	-	-	-*	16	14	19	16
Whole lake	54	62	50	53	35	21	48

Table XIII. The availability of lake trout and whitefish combined in pounds round weight caught per equivalent net-night (see text for definition) to the fishermen who were interviewed during the summer season of 1949. An asterisk indicates a value based on less than 200 net-nights.

Area	June 16-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-16	All Summer
A	105	89	-	-	-	-	90
D	-	106	84	91	129	-	91
E	135	158	202	171	209	129	171
F	96*	136	113	49*	94	87	111
G	69	57*	45*	43*	60	53	58
H	41*	48*	268*	-	69*	50	58
K	77	98	81	100*	86	89*	90
L	-	124	121	115	103	81	108
M	-	-	27*	10*	89	102	94
Whole lake	99	107	106	119	110	89	106

Table XIV. The availability of lake trout in pounds round weight per net-night--for nets cleared daily only--to fishermen who were interviewed during the summer season of 1949. An asterisk indicates a value based on less than 200 net-nights.

Area	June 16-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-15	All Summer
A	51	39	-	-	-	-	50
D	-	59	38	35	46	-	39
E	49	62	84	72	98	76	72
F	36*	23	21	32*	52*	0*	26
G	37	28*	40*	32*	32*	57*	38
H	11*	35*	-	-	56*	40*	45
K	32	30	19	76*	29*	57*	30
L	-	73*	75	51	72*	-	66
M	-	-	27*	68*	70	67*	65
Whole lake	42	40	43	47	70	55	46

Table XV. The availability of whitefish in pounds round weight per net-night--for nets cleared daily only--to fishermen who were interviewed during the summer season of 1949. An asterisk indicates a value based on less than 200 net-nights.

Area	June 16-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-15	All Summer
A	54	45	-	-	-	-	46
D	-	43	34	44	52	-	39
E	71	77	105	86	92	61	83
F	59*	98	78	17*	26*	11*	74
G	30	21*	22*	10*	8*	10*	21
H	4*	13*	-	-	9*	11*	10
K	44	55	39	24*	16*	30*	48
L	-	48*	26	45	45*	-	40
M	-	-	0*	11*	13	15*	12
Whole lake	52	55	46	48	47	32	50

Table XVI. The availability of lake trout and whitefish combined in pounds round weight per net-night--for nets cleared daily only--to fishermen who were interviewed during the summer season of 1949. An asterisk indicates a value based on less than 200 net-nights.

Area	June 16-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-15	All Summer
A	105	84	-	-	-	-	96
D	-	102	72	79	98	-	78
E	120	139	189	158	190	137	155
F	95★	121	99	49★	78★	11★	100
G	67	49★	62★	42★	40★	67★	59
H	15★	49★	-	-	65★	51★	55
K	76	85	58	100★	45★	87★	78
L	-	121★	101	96	117★	-	106
M	-	-	27★	79★	83	82★	77
Whole lake	94	95	89	95	117	87	96

Table XVII. Ranges of depths in feet (extreme values eliminated) of the water in which commercial fishermen set their nets in Great Slave Lake during the summer of 1949.

Area	June 15-30	July 1-15	July 16-31	Aug. 1-15	Aug. 16-31	Sept. 1-16
A	38'-50'	35'-60'	-	-	-	-
D	-	35'-70'	40'-110'	40'-85'	50'-90'	-
E	40'-125'	40'-110'	40'-90'	35'-90'	30'-80'	-
F	-	50'-100'	60'-90'	-	30'-90'	30'-80'
G	40'-110'	-	-	-	-	25'-90'
H	-	-	-	-	40'-120'	30'-100'
K	40'-125'	40'-110'	30'-135'	-	-	-
L	-	40'-120'	50'-160'	30'-130'	35'-150'	30'-125'
M	-	-	-	20'-200'	25'-150'	20'-140'

END

END

END