r do)

their ty be ith a igratters from after flies. fish . just hare day He mpt y be that have ce of ot of vhen nore fish. now vhen . if it lften t, as eed.

re a not , has and love. ict I The ixed

and that hree ime lowthat not that

por-

tion in spring. The question is, when does the salmon first spawn? Does it spawn every year or once in two, or once in three years? By properly marking the fish the last points can be decided and it should have been done long ago. It is reported that the Rhine salmon only spawn three times in its existence? If not killed what becomes of it? Is it past the breeding period of life or does it die of old age? I have seen blind salmon; so have many Restigouche anglers, but nature did not cause it. The mesh of the net, bound across the eyeball was the reason. Columbia River and the Fraser River salmon were reported as dying sure, after spawning, and many before performing that process; and that Columnia River report, states every fish might be caught without injury provided there were a sufficient artificial stock planted, because they only die and never return. The Inspector for B. C. repudiates this idea and in his report on the Fraser says many do return. In Scotland, however, the accepted belief is that salmon spawn yearly, and that salmon that were caught going to sea and marked have returned in six weeks 6 lbs. heavier; and I have seen it reported that salmon enter some of those rivers just to look round, as it were, and return to sea

without spawning.

I would suggest to the proprietors of the Restigouche to ignore the Departmental order forbidding the netting of trout except on the Labrador coast, and if a settler is not able to buy a net give him one. You say, why? Let me tell you it is impossible to have both salmon and trout in quantity in the same stream, and I have not the slightest doubt before a trout reaches 3 lbs. weight in Restigouche River it has destroyed very many thousands of both the eggs and fry of salmon. I have killed, on the salmon beds, both trout and suckers and have taken a heaped gill of eggs from each. Now, the sucker can't eatch the young fry, but the trout, what sweet morsels they are to him. Have you not, brother angler taken him so full that the tail of the smolt stuck out of his mouth? Instead of protecting him put a bounty on his head! The king-fisher and sheldrake are both bad, but I believe the trout is worse. Again, the net for trout saves the smolt. Angling for trout in Sept., I don't kare how careful you may be, destroys numbers of smolt and I would prohibit it. Trout are not near so plentiful of late years in our river, and to this cause may be imputed a portion of our salmon in-From the returns, the main river anglers have no reason to complain, but they did last year say that the upper pools did not pan out as usual. What they did catch were larger fish. My reason for this is the larger numbers of rods on the lower portion of the river. They had the first chance at the rising fish, and a larger proportion of smaller sized, or younger fish, rise. From all accounts of the guardians the stock in the river in October was exceedingly large. The stock was also reported larger in the Upsilquitch river. The Metapedia River seemed to have only a few spring fish in it.