

*By Mr. Reid:*

Q. Before you leave the traps, have you any figures to show the ratio of the fish caught in the Canadian traps as against the fish caught in the American traps?—A. As traps?

Q. As traps.—A. I have not that from memory. That, of course, could be worked out because the figures are published.

Q. In that way we will get one picture against the other?—A. Yes. I am sorry. I would not like to venture even a statement on that. I have not examined it closely enough to be sure of it. The whole catch on the American side in the state of Washington—

*By Mr. MacNeil:*

Q. Have you got the percentage of Canadian fish caught in the traps?—A. Yes, about 2 per cent; that is, of that run. Let me put that statement clearly: if you mean what percentage of the fish in that area passing through there are taken by the Canadians and by the United States, then about 2 per cent; if you mean what percentage of the catch in British Columbia was made in these traps, then I have to give you—

Q. That is the point. How big a factor are they in the fisheries?—A. Between 1 and 2 per cent.

Mr. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, about the year 1935 when the American catch fell so greatly was there not a serious strike among the U.S. fishermen in that year which would affect the American catch?

The WITNESS: Well, there was a serious strike. I would not want—

*By Mr. Reid:*

Q. The strike does not affect the traps?—A. There were no traps in 1935—in 1935 and 1936 there were no traps. Mr. Green's point, as I understand it, is this, that in addition to the traps going out in 1935 the catch on the United States side was further reduced by the fact that there was a serious strike on. There is no question that there was a serious strike.

*By Mr. Neill:*

Q. Was there not a strike in Canadian waters in 1936 too?—A. No; but in 1936 you had that situation—make what you will of it—it can be proven, it is a matter of evidence, and this evidence is given as pretty strong evidence that the fish have in very large numbers largely come around by the north. This further statement, I think, would be of value to the committee, and then, unless you have more questions—

Q. Was not there a strike in the British Columbia waters too among the fishermen in 1935?—A. There was, speaking from memory, among the trollers.

Q. Not among the gill-netters?—A. I do not think so.

Mr. WHITMORE: No; nothing of importance.

*By Mr. Neill:*

Q. What about Rivers Inlet?—A. 1936. A very serious strike in Rivers Inlet.

Q. That would offset any strike in the American side.

Mr. GREEN: Rivers Inlet is a different place altogether. We are talking of the Fraser river. How would that affect the matter?

The WITNESS: Of course, the Rivers Inlet sockeye catch has no relation whatever to the sockeye run under consideration.

[Dr. Wm. A. Found.]