

obliged to prosecute several offenders, and he complained of the disinclination of the Magistrates to do their duty with vigor, and enforce the full penalties of the law. He found the 5th section of the General Regulations defective, because no penalty is attached to its infringement; in the only case in which he had tested it, he was unable to obtain a conviction, and although he had seized the offending nets, he was obliged to restore them. Since my interview with Mr. Harrison, I have received the following letter from him:—

“WOODSTOCK, CARLETON, 10th September, 1867.

“SIR,—I proceeded yesterday morning to Eel River, the lower end of my district, and did not find things entirely satisfactory. I would recommend that fixed nets be entirely done away with, from Fredericton upward, or else a tax of \$10 on every net set, as I am convinced that fixed nets are more destructive to salmon than either drifting or spearing.

“I would further recommend that there should be one Warden from Eel River to Little Presqu'ile, which would include the Parishes of Woodstock and Wakefield on the west, and Northampton and Brighton on the east. For the Parishes of Simonds and Wicklow, Peel and Kent, one or two as the Government may determine.

“I may add that I have always been much interested in the protection of the Fisheries, and have endeavored as far as possible to carry out the laws regarding them.

“I am, Sir, yours sincerely,

“HUGH HARRISON,
“Fishery Warden.

“W. H. Venning, Esq.”

Although Mr. Harrison is the most intelligent Fishery Warden I have conversed with during my tour of inspection, and his opinions are worthy of respect, yet I cannot agree with him in his estimate of the comparative destructiveness of spears and picket nets. I consider spearing the most destructive and reprehensible mode in which salmon can be taken, as by the spear as many salmon are wounded as are taken, and as the clear shallow waters of the spawning grounds offer the greatest facilities for this mode of fishing, it is impossible to over-estimate the damage that is done; though I agree with him that picket nets are more destructive than drifting in such a river as the St. John, still I am not prepared to endorse his opinion as to the propriety of doing away with the former entirely; it would no doubt tend to the preservation of the fish, because fewer would be taken, as there are comparatively few places where drifting could be followed to advantage, so that it would be manifestly unjust to that great majority of settlers whose fronts would not admit the use of drift nets. These latter are very properly prohibited by law, because, if nets are set from each shore, and drifting is allowed in the middle of the river, no fish can escape; therefore, I think it wise to prohibit drifting entirely, and to enforce the regulations more strictly with respect to picket and killock nets, which should both be made to observe the weekly *close time*; but, I fully agree with him as to the justice and expediency of imposing a tax on *all* nets legally used, as those who derive the benefit of the Fisheries should contribute to their protection; at present not one of the owners of the 150 nets which I counted on the St. John, nor of the 110 on the south-west Miramichi, contributed a cent to protect these rivers, which they expect the public to do for their sole benefit.

The *Meduxnakik*, at Woodstock, was formerly one of the best, if not the very best, of all the rivers that flow into the St. John, for salmon, shad and gaspereau, but in consequence of the neglect to place a fish-way in the dam at its mouth it is now nearly deserted by all these fish. Mr. Harrison informed me that he had, several times, notified the owners of this dam, that they had promised to comply with the law, but that nothing effectual had been done. He said a hole had been cut in the bottom of the dam through which an occasional fish might find its way, when not choked up with rubbish, but that it was wholly useless for the purpose intended. He said the lumbering interest was too strong on the St. John—it had swallowed up all other interests—and large mill-owners were privileged characters, with whom it was not safe to interfere. I regret to say that many facts of my