

in which is exhibited the second quality pack, together of course with the first quality pack; I venture to say he will be told the same thing I was told right here in the city of Ottawa.

The deputy minister also states that no purse seining has been allowed for early sockeye salmon. That may be so, but this year the canners came out in their true colours; they were advocating that the whole area at the mouth of the Fraser river be thrown open at all times for purse seining. Then the deputy minister states that up to 1916 there was no sockeye fishing allowed after August 21. He omitted to tell the committee, however, that for years before 1914 the date was October 1. Then he tried to interject the statement that the British dealers reserved their best labels for Canadian goods in years past. Did he tell the committee that some of the British buyers are taking the second quality fish and actually asking for a rebate to take off the first quality lids? During the past year there has been a great demand in the old country for second quality fish, because by simply flipping off the second quality lids those fish can be sold in Great Britain as No. 1 quality.

If I had more time I could place a number of these definite facts before the committee. The deputy minister stated that when the Fraser river emptied into the gulf it flowed north. At its mouth that river is almost two miles wide; it flows approximately five miles an hour, and it flows south, not north. He did not place anything before the committee in support of that statement. I make the unqualified assertion that the Fraser flows south towards the international boundary line. Anyone who crosses from Vancouver to Victoria can see the line of demarcation away towards the gulf islands; the waters of the Fraser are brown and muddy, in contrast to the clear salt water. He also said it had been decided to limit purse seining to a small area. That was not an exact statement of the fact, because the area embraces practically the whole surface covered by the waters which flow from the Fraser river. One of the most terrible statements made, if I may use that term, was that the area which I am asking to have cleared of seines was not frequented by gill net fishermen. When I was home during the recess I took occasion to call the fishermen together and place before them all statements made. I could produce at least a dozen affidavits that gill net fishermen have operated in the area under dispute for the last thirty or thirty-five years.

The deputy minister spoke of the inspection board. That board stated, I suppose after

being asked by the department whether they could tell by inspecting fish whether they had been caught by purse seines or by gill netters, that they could not tell by inspection. What did the deputy minister tell the committee, however? He said they had asked the canners. What is the use of arguing any further about this when, as I say, the canners own or control ninety per cent of the seine boats? What is the use of asking the cannery men whether the fish condemned had been caught by seines or gill nets? I suppose it is only human nature for them to say that the condemned fish were caught by gill nets, because naturally they are all for the seines and against the gill nets. But the inspection board, that board of brokers appointed to inspect the fish they are buying, say they cannot tell. A delegation of fishermen went to the canners two months ago and asked the canners if they could tell whether the fish were caught by gill nets or seines. They told the fishermen they could not tell, and it seems very strange that those statements should be made to the deputy minister. The inspection board seems to be all right when its opinions agree with those of the department, but when the board is against what the department has been advocating, then the opinion of the board is ignored.

I claim that the area under dispute is brackish water. The water of the Fraser flows into the gulf for many miles, but that point was not elaborated very much by the department. They simply ignored the fact that I had claimed that it was brackish water. That is one reason why I think the fisheries committee should have gone into this matter more thoroughly. Witnesses should have been brought from the coast; the cannery men should have been invited also; proper tidal maps should have been produced by the deputy minister to support his contention that after the Fraser entered the estuary of the gulf it flowed north and that the area under dispute was not brackish water. So many misleading statements have been made that I have not time to go into all of them; I can only touch a few, to which I should like to direct the attention of the house. But may I say that while there have been many arguments advanced with regard to the quality of fish and the method of catching them, very little if any argument has been advanced by the department in regard to the time of year when the fish are caught, which is an all important question as far as quality is concerned. What did the department do last year? This is very interesting. At a public meeting it was stated on behalf of the department that the Fraser river had been closed because sixty per cent of the fish were too poor in quality to be