

Mr. McQUARRIE: It struck me that the Committee might not understand the extent of these traps.

WITNESS: The number of them that were there in the big years I would not like to say. I would state, subject to correction, that there would not be less than two hundred, and might be very considerably more. The number of licenses that were taken out was nearer six hundred, on the United States side, but the license does not indicate the number fished.

*By Mr. McQuarrie:*

Q. Would you have any general idea as to the number of fish that would be caught in those traps in a good year?—A. Well, I can give you the packs that were put up on the United States side and the Canadian side. As I said, in 1897 the Americans came into the fishery in earnest. It was from then that you began to see the failure of the off years, that is, that the run of fish—when the spawning was potentially smaller—could not stand the onslaught that was being made on them from both sides of the line. The big years having such tremendous runs seemed unaffected even by the tremendous fishing that was carried on, the quantities were so great.

Q. Have you the packs?—A. I have the packs.

Q. We might put them in.—A. Here they are. I am giving you the pack of sockeye salmon alone. It would not be fair to take the other varieties, as Mr. McQuarrie and Mr. Neill know that there was not a demand for some of the other species, and they were not packed to any extent for quite a number of years afterwards. Therefore it would not be a safe criterion to take any but the sockeye. The sockeye pack in 1897 on the Canadian side was 860,459 cases.

Q. Is that the Fraser River?—A. That is the Fraser River. On the United States side that year, 312,048 cases, or a total of 1,172,507.

Q. That would be fish that came from the Fraser River in both cases?—A. They were hatched in the Fraser River, yes. Four years later, the next big year, 1901, you will see how the figures began to reverse themselves. Our pack was 928,669 cases, and the pack on the United States side was 1,105,096 cases, or a total of 2,033,765 cases. Four years later, in 1905, the next big year, our pack was 837,489 cases, their pack was 847,122 cases, a total of 1,684,611 cases. Four years later, in 1909, our pack was 585,435 cases, their pack was 1,005,120 cases, a total of 1,590,555 cases.

*By Mr. Neill:*

Q. Their catch was double ours?—A. Yes. Four years later, which I will show you in a moment, was the last big year, 1913; our pack was 736,661 cases, their pack was 1,664,827, or a total of 2,401,488 cases.

*By Mr. McQuarrie:*

Q. Could you go right on with the figures up to date?—A. The next cycle, 1917, the pack was on the Canadian side 148,164 cases, on the United States side 411,538 cases, a total of 559,702 cases. Last year, which was the cycle at that year again, these fish being four-year fish, our pack is 35,900 cases; their pack I give you as an estimate, as I have not got their final figures, about 76,000 cases, a total of 111,900 cases.

Mr. GRIMMER: It has fallen off, hasn't it?

The CHAIRMAN: Right here, would it be as well now we have the information, to give us some idea of the number of fishermen fishing in those different years.

Q. Were there as many fishermen fishing in 1921 as there were in 1917, for instance? Is the catch due to the depreciation in the fish, or to the difference in the number of fishermen?—A. The catch since 1913 is, of course, due to the fishery. Prior to that time the number of fishermen would scarcely be a criterion, because on the United States side the fish were caught nearly altogether in traps and purse seines.

[Mr. W. A. Found]