

This is because the fish school before they come up the river to spawn. When they are schooling the seines can spot them by the sea gulls and other birds, and immediately with their high power boats they cut up the schools. In this cutting-up they will easily gather a thousand fish at a time. Some of their catches were as high as 7,000 and 8,000. When the schools are interfered with it takes a little more time for the fish to congregate again before heading up-stream to spawn. That is one of the detrimental effects of seining.

I took the matter up this year with the United States officials to ascertain which was the cheapest method of catching fish, with the trap, the seine or the gill net. Their opinion was that the trap cannot always be considered the cheapest method of fishing. I think many of our men have found that out too, because the trap is costly to construct, and stormy weather in the winter time sometimes washes out the traps. They believed that seines do pick up the fish cheaper. They were not prepared to say whether the fish were of better quality or not. This past year or so the Department has taken the attitude—I use Department in the ministerial sense, not the official—that quality is very desirable, and they maintain the seine picks up a better quality of fish than does the gill net. However, in holding that the greatest good should go to the greatest number, I think the gill net should be encouraged in every way possible. That, I might say, was the finding of the Commission as far back as 1922, when they went out to the British Columbia Coast and investigated the question very fully. They recommended that wherever possible gill nets should be encouraged and seines prohibited.

Here is one argument used by the canners in regard to seines, and it brings in the question of the treaty too. They say, "Well, the Americans have traps across the line." By the way, Mr. Chairman, I should like to show this little map of one section of the Fraser River for the information of the Committee. You will see how close to the boundary the traps come. Our canners say, "If we are going to allow the Americans to catch fish with traps and seines, and allow them to operate in any way they like and in any season, then we should be given the right to go into the adjacent waters with traps and seines to catch fish in competition with the Americans." They point out that, aside from the question of quality—and there may be some argument as to that—with the trap and the seine operating in the vicinity of the international boundary the Americans have been catching about 70 per cent of the total catch of fish. I think that is a fair statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Supposing this treaty went into effect, how would it affect the gill net fishermen?

Mr. REID: I should have to differ a little with Senator Taylor. I regret that I cannot see eye to eye with him.

Hon. Mr. TAYLOR: Go to it, Mr. Reid.

Mr. REID: From the information I have secured regarding the gill net fishermen, I am of opinion that if you allow seines and traps to operate they will completely wipe out the gill net fishermen; but if by any treaty you could bring about any system by way of regulation where the Canadian fishermen, especially on the Fraser River, could be provided with or obtain 50 per cent of the catch, it would certainly be desirable. This would increase their catch from 30 per cent at the present time up to 50 per cent, or a gain of 20 per cent. More fish instead of fewer would be caught by our fishermen.

Hon. Mr. KING: If we did not allow the seines and traps to be operated?

Mr. REID: Yes. If there is to be another treaty discussed, I think the prohibition of seines and traps should be embodied in it.

Hon. Mr. McRÆ: Mr. Reid, as I remember, the treaty, while it regulates seines in the United States waters, does not intend to abolish them or the traps either. In other words, there is no interference with whatever contrivances the