

do not give a true indication of the actual size of the runs. At the same time, the evidence given by the increased volume of canned sockeye production was quite sufficient to show that these fish were running in much greater abundance in 1930 than for years past.

Mr. FOUND: Mr. Chairman, I wonder what is the criticism of those statements? Is there anything involved? I have said nothing to the committee that is in conflict with them. That comparison is made of course since the debacle took place in the Fraser River. The pack that year was possibly the biggest pack on record.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. Found, I cannot read from your own report without your finding fault.

Mr. FOUND: I am finding no fault.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: I said this morning that while there may have been ground for the suggestion that the fishery had become depleted in 1925 when this Convention originated, the first one was made in—

Mr. FOUND: 1929, sir.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: If you will permit me, Mr. Found. It did not originate in 1929. It was a matter of discussion for some time before, as those things usually are. But I said before this was put in in 1930 we actually had reports from the Department that the sockeye salmon run had been restored to a greater degree than ever. Therefore the suggestion that the fishery had become non-existent completely disappeared. Now, why should you, as an officer of the Department, dispute that? Are you not glad it is coming back?

Mr. FOUND: Mr. Chairman, the figures are before the Committee as to what the Fraser River has produced each year since 1909.

You are shown that in 1909 the production—

The CHAIRMAN: 1914, I think it is here.

Mr. FOUND: 1909, the Fraser river. The production of salmon of the sockeye species that year in Canada was 585,435 cases; for the whole area, 1,683,339. In 1913, the last big year, in Canada the sockeye pack alone was 736,661 cases; for the whole area 2,409,760 cases. You have the figures right down to 1933, when the pack was 178,204.

If the term in the treaty, which so far as I know has not been taken exception to before, is figuratively not correct when it says it is largely non-existent I am unable to appreciate it and I submit that the figures at least speak for themselves as to what the percentage is.

Now, to come to the situation that is dealt with in a recent report, we are dealing with a situation as it is and as it has been for a number of years. As I tried to explain to the Committee this morning, we are watching the runs of fish to the different areas each year, and I do think—and I was very pleased to see that the senator supported the view—that the necessary care is being taken where it is found to be essential to prevent a downward trend. With the Fraser river that cannot be done. 1925 was not the start of negotiations. Since 1905 there has been almost continuous negotiation looking to the rehabilitation of a fishery that would be worth a great many millions to this country and this continent if it were rehabilitated. If I have failed to make that position clear, I am sorry, for I have sought to do so.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: My point is that I am trying to do something for the fisheries of British Columbia, and I am met after every sentence with the hostility of the sole representative of the Department. If we had a Minister here I could talk to him, of course, with more advantage. But we have not the advantage of that. I do not think it is up to the officer administering the department to dispute the possibility of doing something other than he has laid down.

The CHAIRMAN: He is only pointing to the record, as I see it, of the average catch or pack of salmon.