

Year	No. of boats
1922.. . . . .	49
1923.. . . . .	50
1924.. . . . .	50
1925.. . . . .	52
1926.. . . . .	52
1927.. . . . .	80
1928.. . . . .	108
1929.. . . . .	136
1930.. . . . .	149

I am told that calculated on the observations of 50 boats, 142,000 salmon were caught by drift nets in 1930. But I claim that that estimate is not correct, and cannot be used to prove that the salmon were fewer in number in the rivers where they go to spawn, because in that year took place the largest catch in the history of anglers on the Restigouche river. In 1928, with 108 boats engaged, there were only 27,600 salmon caught; that is the smallest catch on record with the exception of that of 1926, 23,400. In 1928 not an angler on any of the rivers, the Miramichi, the Nipisiguit and the Restigouche, ever complained of the number of the salmon decreasing, while the number of salmon caught by the drift netters increased. This record shows at the same time there never was a season in which the salmon were so plentiful in the Restigouche as in 1930.

That being the case, if these reports are at all correct, and if the department is relying upon them as the foundation for initiating these stringent regulations, then I say it is not because either of the drifters or of the shore net fishermen that salmon are scarce in the rivers that I have mentioned. Local conditions are the cause, and very often the present cause. For instance, especially on the Nipisiguit river, and to a large extent on the Restigouche, and the Miramichi years ago but not to-day, a large quantity of lumber comes down. On the Nipisiguit the salmon go up as far as Nipisiguit falls; they cannot get beyond that point. Their spawning grounds are to be found at the foot of the falls and in the Papineau branch of the Nipisiguit. The immense quantity of lumber coming down the Nipisiguit river is all stored or boomed between Papineau falls, five miles above the present mill, and the mill site, and there up to last year the quantity of lumber was so great that the water being low the salmon had no passage and could get up to the spawning grounds only in very small numbers. The same is applicable in some years to the Restigouche river. In addition, there are seasons when we have low water in the rivers, when the spring freshets run off swiftly and we

have no rains in June and July. The water becomes so low that in some of these rivers the salmon cannot get back to the spawning grounds.

What has happened in the county of Gloucester? Entering into the bay of Chaleur we have four rivers, the Tetagouche, Middle river, Little Nipisiguit and Big Nipisiguit. Up to four years ago we never caught any salmon and saw only an occasional salmon in the Tetagouche river. To-day the Tetagouche is not only a salmon fishing river but a spawning ground as well, which was not the case five or six years ago. Until a few years ago a salmon never had been caught in Middle river, but to-day it is a salmon river. The Little Nipisiguit, where salmon have been caught at odd times during the past few years, to-day is filled with salmon every season. There is almost as good salmon fishing on the Little Nipisiguit, when the water is reasonably high, as there is on the Big Nipisiguit river.

I am pointing out these facts to show the reason why salmon do not always go up such rivers as the Restigouche to the spawning grounds in large quantities. This is due to local conditions, and the report referred to is sufficient proof that the department has no scientific grounds for adopting regulations to protect the salmon on their way to the spawning grounds, which will throw the fishermen of our coast out of business and cause them to lose the capital they have invested.

I could go on giving reasons why these regulations should not continue, but let me show the scope of the inquiry by these professors into conditions on the Miramichi and the Restigouche in northern New Brunswick. They did not include the Nipisiguit, Tetagouche or Middle rivers, all good spawning grounds. Why was it these scientific men left out some of the best spawning grounds in the province of New Brunswick when they were investigating the conditions under which salmon went up those rivers? They did not make that investigation; the report does not show it. On page 9 there is a paragraph referring to the catch in the Restigouche by anglers. They say that in 1922 there was a good catch on the Restigouche river and a poor general catch; that is, a poor catch by the nets along the bay of Chaleur. That is another proof that local conditions govern entirely. Then they go on:

In particular we note that the low years, 1919 and 1928, on the Restigouche cannot be attributed to local conditions.